The Sea Peoples, Syria, the Philistines, and Phoenicia,
two chapters from *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. 2, Part II (New York, 1975):
Chapter 28, "The Sea Peoples," by R. D. Barnett; and Chapter 33,
"Syria, the Philistines, and Phoenicia," by W. F. Albright.
This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE SEA PEOPLES

I. ANATOLIANS AT THE BATTLE OF QADESH

The thirteenth century B.C. was an age of increasing turmoil, confusion and obscurity, after which it is largely clear that the civilization of the Age of Bronze in the Levant really tottered to its end. If we wish to obtain a picture of this period of sudden decline and collapse, we have to be content to pick our way through a bewildering tangle of evidence, much of it highly fragmentary, much of it highly conjectural and insecure. The former class is based, it is true, on more or less historically authentic records, partly in cuneiform (but these are sparse), partly in Egyptian hieroglyphic documents (but these suffer greatly in value from the imperfect system of vocalization used in them in transcribing foreign names). In the second group of data, we are driven to fall back on the evidence of Greek legendary traditions. These, though precarious, are clearly not to be ignored. The resultant picture is naturally far from clear, and such objectivity as it may possess has been sometimes brought into doubt by too passionate partisanship on the part of individuals who have sought to win conviction for their possibly justifiable theories by massive over-accumulation of uncertain arguments.[1] The picture drawn here is further incomplete in so far as the publication of several important excavations in Lycia,[2] Syria,[3] Cyprus,[4] and Israel,[5] which, it is to be hoped, may soon throw much light on different aspects, is still awaited.

In the year 1300 B.C., the great clash took place at Qadesh in Syria (modern Tell Nebi Mind on the upper Orontes river) between the young Ramesses II and Muwatallish, the Great King of the Hittites.[6] The list of the Hittites' allies, recorded by the Egyptian scribes,[7] includes a number of peoples of Anatolia and

* An original version of this chapter was published as fascicle 68 in 1969; the present chapter includes revisions made in 1973.

[1] §I, 2; §IV, 19; §IV, 20; §IV, 21; §IV, 22. [2] §IV, 17. [3] §VI, 5.

[4] That of Enkomi by Schaeffer and Dikaios is of particular importance. See now §VI, 2 for a brief account.

[5] See A. Biran and O. Negbi, 'The Stratigraphical Sequence at Tel Sippor', in *I.E.J.* 16 (1966), 160 ff.

[6] §I, 4, vol. III, 125 ff.; §I, 6. [7] See above, p. 253.

Syria. This list is of particular importance to us, since it mentions several peoples who all, save the first (*Drdny*), are hitherto already familiar and recognizable from the Hittite imperial records as being the names of peoples of Western and Central Anatolia. The identifications of the remaining names, though necessarily tentative, have been fairly generally accepted among scholars for many years. The list mentions after *Nhrn* (i.e. Mitanni) and *'Irṯw* (Arzawa, the Western Anatolian kingdom[1]), the following apparently Western Anatolian names:

Drdny	usually taken as Δάρδανοι, a Homeric Greek name for Trojans.
Ms	usually taken as equivalent to *Maša*.
Pds	usually taken as equivalent to *Pitašša*.
'Irwn	usually taken as equivalent to *Arawanna*.[2]
Ḳrḳš (or *Ḳlḳš*?)	usually taken as equivalent to *Karkiša*.
Ṙk (or *Lk*)	usually taken as equivalent to *Lukka*.

The Egyptians were on their side aided by *Šrdn* (Sherden)[3] mercenaries, otherwise only once previously mentioned in an Amarna letter *c.* 1375 B.C.[4] The Maša are identified by some with the Μηίονες, or *Μαίονες, an ancient name of the Lydians, but this identification presents difficulties, since, according to some authorities, the Μηίονες invaded Lydia only in the early Iron Age. The mention of *Pds* (*Pitašša*) is of some importance in a later connexion. We do not know exactly where this was, though a place of that name in Western Anatolia was known to the Hittites: in classical times there was a Pedasa near Miletus, and Homer knew very well a Pedasos on the River Satnioeis in the Troad (*Iliad* VI, 35, XX, 92, XXI, 87). Strabo (XIII, 584 and 605) speaks of Pedasos as a city of the Leleges opposite Lesbos. In his second year (1235 B.C.), the pharaoh Merneptah sent a huge gift of corn via Mukish in North Syria through Ura[5] in Western Cilicia to alleviate a severe famine in *Pds* which had formerly fought against Egypt.[6] It is perhaps permissible, with due hesitation, to connect this historical event with legend, and to see in this

[1] §IV, 8, 83 ff.; on the correct location of Arzawa, see H. Otten in *J.C.S.* 11 (1961), 112 f. [2] See above, p. 253. [3] §I, 6, vol. I, 194 ff.

[4] §I, 10, I, nos. 81, 122, 123 (*še-ir-da-ni*, *ši-ir-da-nu*), II, pp. 1166 f., 1521 for reference. Cf. W. F. Albright in §VII, 2, 167, who argues that this word is merely a form of a noun *šerdu*, 'servitor'.

[5] See §I, 2, 21, n. 4, on its location (see again below, p. 376). Another Ura in Anatolia is known on the frontiers of Azzi-Khayasha.

[6] §I, 4, vol. III, 244; §IV, I, 143. A second grave famine in Anatolia occurred some thirty years later; see below, p. 369.

famine, so sore as to become known across the width of the Mediterranean Sea, the grim tribulation which is said by Herodotus[1] to have afflicted Lydia for eighteen years, and finally forced the Etruscans to emigrate from that country. This event is recorded by Herodotus as the Lydians' own version,[2] and is clearly ascribed to a remote antiquity. If it happened at all, it must have taken place before 1000 B.C., for the Etruscans are said to have embarked from the Gulf of Smyrna and they could hardly have done this later without coming into conflict with the Aeolic Greeks who settled, as excavations show,[3] at the head of the bay about this time. It may be noted that an Anatolian origin for the Etruscans was evidently accepted by the Hebrews (or their sources) in the early *mappa mundi* presented in Genesis x, which places Tiras (connected by some with Τυρσηνοί) as a brother of Meshech and Tubal, namely in Phrygia.

The *Arawanna* have sometimes been identified with the Hittite city Arinna[4] and *Karkiša* with Caria.[5] The mention of *Lukka* is of importance since it first raises the question where their home was. According to the Egyptians, they are brigaded closely with the *Krkš*, and it may be no coincidence that in the Hittite treaty of Muwatallish with Alakshandush of Wilusa, Lukka is placed next to *Karkiša* and *Maša* among Wilusa's allies. The Lukka-lands are often mentioned in Hittite annals as a restless and turbulent area in the west of Anatolia, but we meet some difficulties if, as is often done, we identify the *Lk* mentioned in Egyptian records with the later Lycia—an identification first put forward by de Rougé[6] in 1861—even if we combine the Hittites' *Lukka* with Lycia and even with Lycaonia.

Here archaeology is, for the present, of little help, because no remains of the Late Bronze Age have so far been found or excavated on the Lycian coast, though there are signs that this apparent absence may turn out not to apply to the interior.[7] Perhaps the existence of a common stem *Lu-* in the names of several Anatolian peoples (Lycians, Lydians, Lycaonians, Lulahhi, Luwians) may suggest a common origin. A tribe of 'Inner Lycaones' lived even in Central Phrygia near Pisidian Antioch in Roman times,[8] but the *Lukka* appear to have been a people living on and by the sea, being mentioned in 1375 B.C. as pirates in another Amarna

[1] Book I, 94. [2] *Ibid.*

[3] E. Akurgal, 'Bayrakli Kazisi on Rapor.' In *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7 (1950).

[4] §IV, 8, 20. [5] §IV, 6. [6] §I, 8, 303 ff. [7] §IV, 17.

[8] A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937), 38, 66, 93.

letter.[1] (It has been claimed that the Lukka or *Lk* were present in the Levant from at least the Egyptian Middle Kingdom, on the basis of a reference to a member of that people in an Egyptian hieroglyphic inscription found at Byblos, but this evidence has now been disputed.[2]) The Lycians in later times spoke a dialect descended from Luwian and closely related to Hittite,[3] and preserved it tenaciously into Hellenistic times. It would seem not unreasonable that their historical origins should be traced back to the *Lukka*. According to Greek traditions the Lycians, led by Sarpedon, in the Homeric poem formed part of the allies of Troy.[4] A slight difficulty remains in that we are told that the true name of the Lycians was Termili[5] (Lycian *trm̃ml*), while Lukka was, to the Hittites at least, only a geographical, not a tribal or racial, appellation. Whatever the explanation may be, in the deteriorating state of affairs of the fourteenth to thirteenth centuries B.C. the Lukka certainly played a part, if only that of an irritant.

What was going on in the cultural world of the coast of Western Asia Minor at this time is still largely wrapped in mystery, except for the fitful disclosures of excavation. If Troy and Ilios are correctly identified with *Taruiša* and *Wilušiya*, then Troy formed part of the Hittite Empire,[6] and if Assuwa was Asia[7] we have in this treaty to which we have referred a picture of the Assuwan league in the thirteenth century B.C. Miletus is widely thought to be the Millawanda of the Hittites.[8] At Miletus, though it was a Carian country, a powerful Mycenaean or pro-Mycenaean colony was evidently established from the fifteenth century B.C.[9] At Old Smyrna was a pre-Greek, non-Greek city, but unfortunately the details are largely unpublished.[10] The coastal darkness is only deepened by an occasional discovery such as that at Phaestus in Crete, in a Middle Minoan context *c.* 1500 B.C., of an extraordinary clay disk bearing a spirally written inscription[11] in a strange form of pictographs impressed with movable stamps into the clay while yet soft—a primitive but undeniable anticipation of printing; an invention which remained as far as we know unique in antiquity, and still-born. The forty-five signs used include designs which may represent a ship with a high prow, a house or hut possibly of Lycian type and, most notably, a war-

[1] §I, 10, no. 38, 10—*amēlūtu ša (māt)lu-uk-ki*, 'people of Lukki'.
[2] §I, 1.
[3] §IV, 12.
[4] *Iliad*, II, 876; V, 479, etc.
[5] Herodotus, VII, 92.
[6] See *C.A.H.* II³, pt, I, p. 677.
[7] §IV, 2.
[8] §IV, 8, 80 ff.
[9] See above, pp. 340 f.
[10] See above, p. 361, n. 3.
[11] A. Evans, *The Palace of Minos*, fig. 482. See *C.A.H.* II³, pt. I, pp. 595 ff.

rior's head crowned with what appear to be feathers. The discovery in Crete of two allegedly similar, but incised and shorter texts[1] now gives some scholars to think that the Phaestus disk is Cretan, but it may well have some Anatolian affinities or describe some Anatolian business.[2] Does the disk refer, or belong, to some other kindred people? Is it about Lycians?—or are these the *σήματα λυγρά* carried by Bellerophon to Lycia?[3] Herodotus (VII, 92) mentions that in his day the Lycian sailors wore a 'cap set about with feathers', but we have as yet no illustration of this headgear to compare it with that on the disc and to cause us safely to accept its evidence for a continuity of tribal fashions lasting until a thousand years later. Nor can either of these feather headdresses, whether that of Phaestus, or of the Lycians, even if mutually connected in our view, safely be connected with that of the Philistines to be described below.[4]

II. MOPSUS AND THE *DNNYM*

The impression of deepening distress and disturbance in Western Anatolia in the thirteenth century B.C., possibly due to climatic changes and famine,[5] amply reflected in Greek legends and the Hittite records, is conveyed more clearly by the affair of the prince of Zippashla, Madduwattash[6] (bearer of a name seemingly of later Lydian type similar to such as Sadyattes or Alyattes) who, in conspiracy with the king of Ahhiyawa, eventually united the western kingdoms of Anatolia against their lawful liege lord, the king of Khatti, and even swallowed up Pitashsha (= *Pds* of the Egyptians?). In his train came a freebooter named Mukshush, who followed him in some capacity which is left unclear by the fragmentary nature of the text, in which Mukshush is mentioned

[1] W. F. Brice, *Inscriptions in the Linear A Script*, 2.

[2] The hut sign (no. 24) has a strange and apparently identical precursor on a sign incised on an Early Bronze Age potsherd found in 1963, suggesting a direct continuity both of the script and of the timber architecture of Lycia. (Machteld J. Mellink, 'Lycian Wooden Huts and Sign 24 of the Phaistos Disk', *Kadmos*, 3, 1, 1964.)

[3] *Iliad*, VI, 168.

[4] See below, p. 372.

[5] The theory that the collapse of the Late Bronze Age world in both Greece and Anatolia alike was due to a vast cyclic climatic change, producing drought and universal famine conditions leading to mass migrations, is powerfully argued in §I, 5. Another theory would attribute it in large part to the great volcanic explosion of Thera and consequent tidal wave, which is ascribed to 1200 B.C. instead of, as hitherto, *c.* 1500 B.C. See Leon Pomerance, *The Final Collapse of Santorini* (*Thera*) (Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology, vol. XXVI, Göteborg, 1970).

[6] §IV, 9; see also above, pp. 264 f.

only once.[1] The significance of his name was not apparent until Bossert's brilliant discovery at Karatepe of the bilingual text where the name of Mukshush is rendered in the Hittite hieroglyphic (i.e. Luwian) version as Muk(a)sas, but in Phoenician as *Mpš*.[2] It is now accepted that Mukshush, the companion of Madduwattash, is identical in name with Mopsus, a strange figure of Greek legend, a seer and prince of Colophon, a city where a Mycenaean settlement certainly existed, as shown by excavations.[3] Mopsus, son of Rhakius of Clarus and Manto, daughter of Teiresias, was reputed to have engaged in a contest of divination with another seer, Calchas, at Clarus and to have founded the famous sanctuary of Apollo there.[4] Another version calls him a Lydian, son of Lydus, and brother of Torrhebus. In Lydian traditions, Mopsus' name seems to be recorded as Moxus,[5] a name also met in Greek Linear B tablets as *mo-qo-so*.[6] A year before the end of the Trojan war (so legend tells) Mopsus set out southwards with a band of followers, accompanied by Amphilochus and two Lapiths named Leonteus and Polypoetes.[7] Moving into Pamphylia, Mopsus founded its most notable cities, Aspendus and Phaselis; then, entering Cilicia, he built the half-Greek cities of *Mopsou-hestia*, 'Mopsus' hearth' (where there was later a famous oracle of the hero, clearly in recollection of his prowess in life as a soothsayer himself), and Mallus, the latter founded jointly with Amphilochus. Mopsus' name was also commemorated in Cilicia at *Mopsou-krene* ('Mopsus' spring'). Less factually perhaps, but significantly, he is said to have married Pamphyle, daughter of Kabderus (a name obviously derived from Caphtor[8]), an aetiological myth evidently designed to explain how the mixed population of Aspendus and Phaselis resulted from intermarriage of Greeks (or half-Greeks) with natives. Whoever those were, it was agreed by the Greeks that the Pamphylians were a racial hotch-potch, as their name suggested. From Cilicia Mopsus, according to the Lydian historian Xanthus,[9] moved on to Askalon, where he threw the statue of the goddess Astarte into her own lake, and finally died there.

H. Bossert's discovery in 1946[10] of the bilingual inscriptions at Karatepe in the Ceyhan valley of Cilicia in Southern Turkey, written in the Phoenician alphabet and in Hittite hieroglyphs (i.e. Luwian), described above, not only finally solved the riddle

[1] §I, 2, 61 ff. [2] §IV, 1, 142. [3] See above, p. 184.
[4] §IV, 2, 54. [5] §I, 2, 56 ff.
[6] §V, 6, tablets KN X 1497 and PY Sa 774. [7] See above, pp. 355 f.
[8] See below, p. 374. [9] §IV, 25. [10] §IV, 4; §IV, 5.

of the reading of the hieroglyphs, but made a historical contribution of unusual importance by transforming for the first time a figure of Greek legend, Mopsus, into an undeniable historical personality.[1] In this inscription, King Azitawatas, author of the Karatepe texts, discloses himself as a lesser chieftain of the Danuniyim (the exact vocalization of the name is uncertain; these people of the ninth century B.C. are clearly the same as the Danuna mentioned in the fourteenth century B.C. in an Amarna letter[2]) who seem to have formed an important kingdom[3] in the fourteenth century B.C., but whose chief city was probably Pakhri, mentioned by Shalmaneser III[4] and identifiable with Pagrai in the Amanus mountains. It is of importance that, where the Hittite hieroglyphic, i.e. Luwian, text describes Azitawatas's overlord Awarkus[5] (identified usually with a king of Que or Cilicia mentioned in the Assyrian records of Tiglath-pileser III under the name of Urikki), as 'king of the city of Adana', the Phoenician text describes him as 'king of the Danuniyim'. The names are thus virtually identical, the prefixed 'A' of Adana having some unexplained implication.[6] Further, a connexion is perhaps to be seen with Greece in the likely identification of Danuniyim–Danuna with the Greek Danaoi and the family of Danaos, who is credited in Greek legends with an oriental origin.[7] Possibly these *Dnnym* may be also the hitherto elusive Hypachaioi, or 'sub-Achaeans' of Cilicia, mentioned by Herodotus (VII, 91) as a former name of the Cilicians.[8] Some scholars have seen, somewhat dubiously, a survival of the name of Achaeans ('Αχαιοί) in the Assyrian name Que (= *Qawa?) for Eastern Cilicia.[9] More important, Azitawatas states in his inscription that he is of the house of *Mpš*, or Mopsus, whose name, as we have said, is rendered in the Luwian version as Muksas by a *p* > *k* change for which

[1] See below, pp. 679 ff. Since 1969, however, it has been powerfully argued by Otten (A, 12) and others, on both philological and historical grounds, that the Madduwattash episode and consequently Mopsus' date have to be put back to the early fourteenth century B.C. As stated in *C.A.H.* II³, pt. 1, p. 677, the present *History* cannot take full cognizance of this development and treats these texts in the traditional way.

[2] §I, 10. The value of the Mopsus legend in history is well discussed in §I, 2, 53 ff.

[3] The considerable extent of their kingdom as far as the Amanus is discussed by §I, 2.

[4] §I, 2, 2 n. 4.

[5] '*Wrk* in the Phoenician version.

[6] Since, according to Stephanus, the founder of Adana was called Adanos, M. C. Astour believes that Adana is derived from a personal name (Adan = lord), §I, 2, 39; §I, 2, 2.

[7] §I, 2, ch. I.

[8] §IV, 13; §IV, 14.

[9] §IV, 13.

Lydian gives illustrations.[1] This form of his name (Moxus), which is recorded by Xanthus, adds a city, Moxoupolis, in Southern Phrygia to his list of foundations and connects with him a tribe of Moxianoi in Western Phrygia.

III. THE CLASH OF SEA AND LAND RAIDERS WITH EGYPT

The *razzia* of Mopsus may be reasonably regarded[2] as part of the downward thrust of the horde of assailants whom the Egyptians called collectively the 'Peoples of the Sea'—who first massed against Egypt from the West via Libya in the reign of the pharaoh Merneptah about 1232 B.C., but were then repulsed and withdrew.[3] These events were known to us largely from the Egyptian accounts, but a casual reference in the Bible to the bloody repulse by Shamgar Ben-Anath of a force of six hundred invading Philistines (Judges iii. 31) may refer to this phase of preliminary probings, and there are some archaeological reasons to think that some settlement by Philistines or other closely related 'Sea Peoples' in Palestine, e.g. at Beth-shan and Tell el-Fār'ah, may start in this period[4] before 1200 B.C. Soon, gathering full strength and benefiting from the overthrow of the Hittite Empire in about 1200 B.C., the Sea Peoples surged down again like a flood through Syria and Palestine, carrying all before them, until they were stayed only at the north-eastern gates of Egypt.

Let us take the earlier onslaught first. In his records at Karnak and Athribis[5] Merneptah (1236–1223 B.C.) boasts that he won his great victory in Libya in his fifth year (1232 B.C.) against an army of Libyans and Meshwesh (the later 'Maxyes'), who were supported by an alliance of northern sea-borne forces. Their names are given as *'Iḳwš* (vocalized variously as Akawasha, Akaiwasha, or Ekwesh), *Trš* (Teresh or Tursha), *Lk* (Lukku or Lukka), *Šrdn* (Sherden or Shardana), *Škrš* (Sheklesh or Shakalsha), 'northerners coming from all lands'. These names

[1] §1, 2, 62: as stated above, p. 364 and n. 6, the *q* is preserved in Mycenaean Greek, i.e. Linear B versions of his name, but paradoxically it is the Phoenician version in the Karatepe text which has followed a Western Anatolian tendency to change *q* to *p*.

[2] See now, however, above, p. 365, n. 1.

[3] §1, 4, vol. III, 238 ff.; see also above, p. 233.

[4] §VII, 25; §VII, 27. At Tell el-Fār'ah, five tombs with multiple burials in the '900' cemetery have been recognized as strongly Mycenaean in type, containing LM IIIb ware, yet otherwise Philistine in their content.

[5] §1, 4, vol. III, 240 ff; see also above, pp. 233 f.

include only two which were previously known, namely Lukka and Sherden.[1] The numbers of prisoners recorded by the pharaoh's scribes as captured are given as: Sheklesh, 222; Teresh, 742; Akawasha, 2,201. These figures, though we need not trust them too blindly, might well imply that the Akawasha were the strongest element and very probably to some extent the ringleaders, but the Athribis stela gives the figure of 2,200 as Teresh, thereby injecting some doubts into our minds about its accuracy. All these peoples are described as 'of the Sea'.[2] The ending of their names in *-sha* has suggested since Maspero (1897) an Asia Minor ethnic ending; today we might see it as an Indo-European nominative. Illustrations of several of these peoples occur in various Egyptian triumphal scenes,[3] and aid us in identifying them. No illustration exists of Lukka or Akawasha, but we learn with surprise that the Akawasha were circumcised Merneptah, in his victory inscriptions at Karnak and Athribis,[4] records the number of slain Akawasha, mentioning that their hands were cut off instead of their genital members as was done in the case of uncircumcised victims. Since de Rougé's time, too, Akawasha have been identified with Ἀχαιοί, the Mycenaean Greeks and, since the recovery of the Hittite records, by most with the Ahhiyawa.[5] If this is so, it is absolutely out of keeping with everything that we know about the Greeks, and therefore about the Akawasha, that they should have been circumcised, though it was a practice common to both Egyptians and Semites. The matter remains inexplicable.[6]

The Tursha (or Teresh) and Sheklesh–Shakalsha are shown bearded alike, the Sheklesh wearing a high headcloth, the Tursha a smaller type; both sport a pointed kilt with tassels and many hang a medallion on a cord or thong round their necks—a custom common in Syria and Anatolia, even in Iran.[7] Their armament consists of a pair of spears or a *khepesh* (scimitar); their chests are protected by bandaging with strips perhaps of linen or leather. These two races have been identified since Champollion and de Rougé,[8] though, admittedly, only speculatively, with the Etruscans (the Tyrsenoi of Lydia who bear the ethnic ending in -ēnos, common in Anatolia) and the Sicels, who are supposed by the

[1] See above, pp. 360 f. also p. 233 and below p. 508.
[2] §I, 8, 305 and 318.
[3] §I, 19, pl. 160A and 160B; §I, 19, plate on p. 342.
[4] See above, p. 366 n. 5.
[5] §I, 8.
[6] But see §I, 2, 355 ff.
[7] §III, 3, 83 ff. and reference therein; §III, 2.
[8] §I, 8.

advocates of this view to have been on their way westwards to their ultimate Mediterranean home in Sicily.[1] In fact, newcomers are said to appear at this time in Sicily bringing with them a new type of lugged axe; the archaeological evidence in Italy, however, for the arrival of the Etruscans so early is still wanting.

The Sherden, who as mercenaries are known in Egyptian records from the time of Amenophis III, are shown in Egyptian reliefs as beardless and wearing a very distinctive helmet (sometimes held under the chin with a chinstrap) with a large knob or disc at its apex, and ornamented with enormous projecting bull's horns.[2] They are armed with a round shield with a handle, and brandish a huge two-edged sword of distinctive type, suitable either for slashing or thrusting. A unique example of it, now in the British Museum, was obtained in 1911 at Beit Dāgān, a Palestinian village near the town of Jaffa (it was not from Gaza, as often misstated).[3] The Sherden have been very plausibly identified with the bronze-working population of the Sardinian stone-built towers or *nuraghi*, a race whose remarkably vigorous bronze statuettes (though hitherto known from examples not earlier than the ninth century B.C.) often show them as warriors armed with round shields and wearing horned helmets resembling the Sherden type, but without the central knob or disc very characteristic of Sherden.[4] A further connexion between Corsica and the Sherden is strongly suggested by R. Grosjean's[5] recent observation that menhir-like tombstones still stand in Corsica showing male warriors wearing banded corselets, daggers and formerly horned helmets, the horns having been separately inserted into holes in the stone, but now having long disappeared. That the Sherden were seafarers and pirates is more than likely. It fits the evidence fairly well that the builders of the *nuraghi* appear suddenly in Sardinia between about 1400 and 1200 B.C., though we have no positive indication as to whence they came.[6]. It is likely enough that they immigrated into Sardinia from Cyprus,[7] where they may well have been a native

[1] See below, ch. XXXVII, sect. II. [2] E.g. §I, 19, pl. 160 B.

[3] See R. D. Barnett, *Illustrations of Old Testament History* (London, 1966), 29 and fig. 16. Near Beit Dāgān is the ancient site of Azor, now under excavation, where plentiful Philistine material occurs.

[4] §II, 1, 187 ff. [5] §II, 2. [6] §II, 1, 111 and 187 ff.

[7] A significant pointer to contacts between Cyprus and Sardinia in this period is to be seen in the occurrence in Sardinia of copper ingots of the characteristic 4-handled Cypriot shape, derived from a leather hide, now well known from the Cape Gelidonya wreck. (See above, pp. 214 f.; and G. Bass, 'The Cape Gelidonya Wreck' in *A.J.A.* 65 (1961), 267 ff.)

copper-working people. In the earliest Phoenician inscription found in Sardinia, that from Nora, probably of the ninth century B.C., although it is incomplete, the name of the island appears as Shardan (*be-shardan*), and thus the identification of Sardinia with the Sherden seems much strengthened.[1] Another pointer in Sardinia to the former presence of the Sea Peoples lies in the representation in a bronze figure and on the island's coins in Roman times of the eponymous divine ancestor Sardus Pater as a bearded man wearing a stiffly erect headdress,[2] resembling that favoured by Sea Peoples, particularly the Philistines, to be described below.

As we have said, the final assault on Egypt came after the turn of the thirteenth century B.C. The gathering clouds are reflected in the last documents found at Khattusha and Ugarit. Among the tablets from the archives of Rap'anu found at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) during the 20th and 26th seasons of excavations were three letters mentioning a famine in Anatolia (Khatti). Ugarit is asked to send 2,000 measures of grain from Mukish to Ura in Cilicia.[3] In another letter from Ras Shamra[4] the king of Ugarit appeals for help to the king of Alashiya (almost certainly Cyprus), whom he calls 'my father'. A reply (?) found in the oven from one *Ydn* urges him to arm a considerable fleet of 150 ships to resist the enemy. Meanwhile, the king of Ugarit writes: 'Does not my father know that all my forces and chariots are stationed in Khatti Land, and all my ships are in Lukka Land?' [which is thus identifiable as coastal] 'Thus the country is abandoned to itself... seven enemy ships have appeared and inflicted much damage upon us.'[5] Clearly, the combined fleets are massing off Lycia, while the armies are joining up in the West. By the end of the reign of Shuppiluliumash II, the last Hittite king, we find from Hittite sources that Alashiya has changed sides, and its ships are fighting against the Hittites. Finally, a tablet found at Boğazköy in 1961 reports the defeat of the Alashiyan navy.[6] 'I called up arms and soon reached the sea, I, Shuppiluliumash, the Great

[1] *C.I.S. I*, no. 144, on p. 191; see also W. F. Albright below, ch. XXXIII and *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 83 (1941), 14 ff.

[2] G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1887), vol. IV, fig. 7 on p. 21. He seems however to have been also identified with the Phoenician god of Hunting, Sid; see U. Bianchi, 'Sardus Pater' in *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, ser. VIII, 18 (1963), 97 ff. and S. Moscati, 'Antas: a new Punic site in Sardinia', in *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 196 (Dec. 1964), 23 ff.

[3] J. Nougayrol, *Ugaritica* v (1968), texts 33, 44 and 171. See also §I, 3, 253 ff.

[4] §I, 3, 255.

[5] §IV, 18, 20 ff.

[6] See above, p. 265; §IV, 18.

King, and with me the ships of Alashiya joined battle in the midst of the sea. I destroyed them, catching them and burning them down at sea.' Meanwhile, at Boğazköy, in the royal palace of Büyükkale all the walls were demolished and the flood of invaders poured onwards in a southerly direction perhaps joining hands with the coastal force led by Mopsus and his allies. At about this time the late Mycenaean settlement at Miletus in Caria was burnt. In Cilicia Mersin,[1] with its late Hittite palace, fell, as did Tarsus.[2] So, too, fell Carchemish, the great capital city controlling the crossing of the Euphrates, from which the Hittite Great King's Viceroy had long ruled over the cities of North Syria.[3] Ras Shamra–Ugarit and Tell Sūkās[4] on the Syrian coast were sacked; the former never recovered. Hamath was captured and occupied by the newcomers, who, it seems, after the resettlement were responsible for introducing the rite of cremation burial,[5] as happened at Carchemish,[6] Tell Sūkās,[7] and Açana.[8] This suggests that the Sea Peoples brought it with them. Sidon, too, was destroyed, according to tradition, while its inhabitants fled to Tyre.[9] Tell Abu Hawwām (identified by Mazar with Salmon, a Tyrian colony), a vast site on the Palestinian coast near Haifa, likewise fell.[10] With several of these destructions is associated the discovery of LH III C I *a* pottery, a circumstance which may well indicate the presence or passage of the Akawasha–Achaeans mentioned by Merneptah. The story in Cyprus is similar. Excavations at Kition (Larnaca) since 1962, until then supposed to have been a purely Phoenician foundation of the Iron Age, show that it was a wealthy city in the Bronze Age, comparable with Enkomi,[11] but there are traces of a great catastrophe at the end of the thirteenth century B.C., followed by fresh settlers. These were evidently the first Greek settlers, who built themselves large houses of ashlar masonry, and used LH III C I pottery. This settlement was short-lived, being destroyed by the same movement of the Sea Peoples as Enkomi. It was reconstructed before the period of LH III C 2 or 'Granary Style' pottery which was used there in the eleventh century. It was finally abandoned *c.* 1075 B.C. after a catastrophe, probably an earth-

[1] §IV, 7. [2] §IV, 10.

[3] See E. Laroche, 'Matériaux pour l'étude des relations entre Ugarit et le Hatti', *Ugaritica*, 3, 1956 (ed. C. F. A. Schaeffer).

[4] §I, 15

[5] §I, 16; W. F. Albright in *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 83 (1941), 14 ff.

[6] C. L. Woolley and R. D. Barnett, *Carchemish*, vol. III (London, 1952).

[7] §I, 15. [8] §I, 18.

[9] Justin, XVIII, 3, 5; cf. Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* VIII, 62.

[10] §VII, 20. [11] §VI, 3; A, 9.

quake, only later to be recolonized by the Phoenicians. Similarly, at Enkomi[1] in the early twelfth century the 'Close Style' appears, perhaps emanating from Rhodes, which was by now under control of the Achaeans, possibly those known to the Hittites as Ahhiyawa. (This is the point at which the Hittite king Arnuwandash III is complaining to Madduwattash that he has supported Attarshiyash and Piggaya in seizing Cyprus.[2]) The 'aristocratic' quarter on the west side of the city was burnt, probably by Sea Peoples, at the beginning of the twelfth century B.C., but industrial life continued, using debased Levanto-Helladic ware in Levels IV–II. 'Granary Style' then appears in Levels III–II, finally dominating by the time of Level I, together with Cypriot Iron Age I pottery.[3] At Paphos, the city and shrine of Aphrodite was traditionally founded (or refounded) by an Arcadian, Agapenor.[4]

IV. THE PHILISTINES

In his fifth year (1194 B.C.), Ramesses III found himself involved in a fresh war with the Libyans on his western border, and reports in his triumphal record at Medīnet Habu that already[5] 'the northern countries quivered in their bodies, namely the Peleset, Tjekk[er]... They were cut off [from] their land, coming, their spirit broken. They were *thr*[6]-warriors on land; another [group] was on the sea...' Three years later, he graphically pictures the collapsing world of the Levant as far as the farthest horizon: 'As for the foreign countries, they made a conspiracy in their isles. Removed and scattered in the fray were the lands at one time. No land could stand before their arms, from Khatti, Qode [= Cilicia], Carchemish, Yereth [= Arzawa], and Yeres [Alashiya] on, [but they were] cut off at [one time]. A camp [was set up] in one place in Amor [Amurru]. They desolated its people, and its land was like that which has never come into being. They were coming, while the flame was prepared before them, forward toward Egypt. Their confederation was the Peleset, Tjekker, Sheklesh, Denye[n] and Weshesh lands united.'[7] From

[1] §VI, 2; §VI, 4; §VI, 6.
[2] §IV, 9, 157 ff.; §VI, 3; see above, ch. XXIV, sect. IV; but see above, p. 365, n. 1.
[3] §VI, 3.
[4] Strabo, XIV, 6, 3.
[5] §I, 4, vol. IV, 18–26; W. F. Edgerton and J. A. Wilson, *Historical Records of Ramses III*, pp. 30 f.; see below, pp. 507 ff.; above, pp. 241 ff.
[6] A foreign word for chariot-warriors, see §I, 13, 239, n. 3; §I, 7, 40.
[7] Edgerton and Wilson, *op. cit.* p. 53.

the above account it is deducible (though not by any means proved) that the clash took the form of two battles:[1] the first in Syria (Amurru or Zahi) against the Land Raiders, perhaps taking the form of a rearguard action; the second real fight, against the Sea Raiders, taking place in the Delta at the entrance to Egypt itself, though Schaeffer[2] believes that this battle too occurred far north of the frontier, near Arvad. This sea battle is depicted in the sculptures of the exquisite temple at Medīnet Habu with great realism.[3] The Egyptians are aided by Sherden mercenaries. The Peleset are clean-shaven, wearing a very distinctive head-gear made of what seems to be a circle of upright reeds (or possibly leather strips or horsehair not, as often said, feathers) mounted on a close-fitting cap with a horizontal, variously decorated band round the wearer's brow.[4] The whole head-dress was held in place by a chin-strap tied under the chin. On their bodies the Peleset or Philistines, for such they are, wear a panelled kilt, falling in front to a point, usually decorated with tassels (such a tasselled kilt is worn by a Southern Anatolian god on a stele from near Çağdin[5]) and their chests are protected by bandaging with horizontal strips, perhaps of linen, or a ribbed corselet. They carry a pair of spears, sometimes a full-size rapier sword (which, it has been argued, has Caucasian affinities[6]), and a circular shield with a handle like those of the Sherden. On land, they fight in the Hittite manner from a chariot with crews of three, consisting of two warriors and a driver, while their families follow, partially guarded in wooden ox-drawn peasant carts usually of Anatolian type with solid wheels, like those used by the Hittites at the Battle of Qadesh. The draught animals are humped oxen, a breed bred in Anatolia, but not used in the Aegean or Palestine.[7] It is universally agreed that the Peleset are the Philistines of the Bible, of whom these Egyptian records thus form the first explicit historical mention. This people clearly in some respects has a strong connexion with Anatolia—a point supported by their monopoly and expert mastery of metal-working (cf. I Sam. xiii. 19–22 often interpreted as reference to

[1] This is suggested in §I, 13, 260, n. 4.

[2] §VI, 4, 60.

[3] §I, 20, 334–8, 340.

[4] T. Dothan suggests that this decorated band, bearing knobs, zigzag patterns or vertical fluting indicates differences of rank or class (A, 5). It is also worn in this battle by Tjekker and Denyen.

[5] H. T. Bossert, *Altanatolien*, fig. 567.

[6] R. Maxwell-Hyslop, 'Daggers and Swords in Western Asia', in *Iraq*, 8 (1946), 59 f. (type 53).

[7] §I, 10, 338 f.

ironworking) of which the Hittite kings boasted some skill, and which is attested by the actual discovery of increasing amount of artifacts of iron at the Philistine sites in Palestine of 'Ain Shems, Tell Jemmeh, Fā'rah, Azor and Ashdod.[1] Other indications equally, or even more clearly, point to very close connexions with the Mycenaean Greeks (who as Akawasha are in fact quoted by the Egyptians as serving with the Philistines against Egypt in year 5 of Ramesses III). That the Philistines traditionally had a connexion of some kind with Crete is upheld by the fact that part of the Philistine coast was called the 'Cretan' South or *negeb* (I Sam. xxx. 14), and Cretans are sometimes described with Philistines in the Bible (Ezekiel xxv. 16, Zeph. ii. 5).[2] The ships in which the Philistines are shown fighting against the Egyptians in the sea battle are of a most unusual type, powered by sail only, not by oars, with a central mast bearing a crow's nest, a curved keel, a high stern and prow ending in a duck's head; yet such a ship is depicted on a late Helladic III vase[3] from Skyros, and on a Levanto-Helladic Pictorial Style vase from Enkomi.[4] Some scholars have seen significance in two Philistine words preserved in the Hebrew Bible: *kōba'* (I Sam. xvii. 5), for Goliath's helmet, apparently to be derived from the Anatolian word *kupaḫḫi* (helmet); and the Philistines' word for chieftain, preserved in Hebrew as *seren*, which may be connected with the word τύραννος 'lord', itself borrowed by the Greeks from Lydia.[5] Others see in the challenge to single combat between David and the Philistine champion Goliath a typically European, Hellenic idea. An important index is naturally the Philistines' very distinctive pottery (including a rapidly growing group of distinctive cult vessels and figurines),[6] partly Mycenaean in shape, yet unlike Mycenaean ware in being not varnish-painted but matt-painted bichrome ware, decorated in metopes, often with volutes, a common design being a swan with turned-back head. It is connected with LH III c 1b ware of Greece and Rhodes (the so-called 'Close Style'). This Philistine pottery is not merely found at the sites in Palestine associated with the Philistine invasion, at Megiddo in Levels VII A, VI B and A and in Beth Shemesh in Level III, but also closely

[1] §vii, 1; §vii, 6. R. de Vaux considers that the Sea Peoples' ships, apart from prow and poop, basically do not differ from Syrian merchant-ships depicted on Egyptian reliefs (A, 13).

[2] A group of Cretan seals was found near Gaza: V. Kenna, *Cretan Seals* (Oxford, 1960), 65, 78, 151 f.

[3] §v, 7, figs. 43 f. on p. 259.

[4] §vi, 7, fig. 10 (from Tomb 3, no. 2620).

[5] See below, p. 516 and n. 3.

[6] §vii, 5; §vii, 15; §vii, 16.

resembles LH III 1b ware found at Enkomi and Sinda[1] in Cyprus.

We might perhaps hope to find some clues to the Philistines' origins in their religion, but of the Philistines' religion we know almost nothing, since their gods of later times—Dagon, Ashtoreth and Ba'al-zebūb—are clearly either Canaanite or adaptations to Canaanite cults. B. Mazar sees in the introduction and spread of the cult of Ba'al-shamem, god of the sky, Philistine influence inspired by the Greek Olympian Zeus.[2] H. Margulies[3] sees in the reference to flies and bees in Philistine cults and legends such as that of Samson allusions to bee-cults and other worships and beliefs of the Greek and Minoan world. Early terracotta figurines illustrating a seated female deity of Mycenaean style have been found in excavations at Ashdod which point clearly to a Mycenaean origin.[4] Philistine burial customs take various forms, including Mycenaean-type chambers with *dromoi* and anthropoid clay coffins at Tell el-Fār'ah[5] (probably to be identified with Sharuhen) in the twelfth and early eleventh centuries B.C. and cremations at 'Azor (like those of Hamath) in the eleventh. At Beth-shan in the thirteenth century begin these clay slipper-type sarcophagi with heads crudely modelled in relief.[6] Some of the heads on these sarcophagus lids have the decorated headbands characteristic of the Philistines and in one case a row of vertical strokes indicating the common Sea Peoples' war headdress. Over the dead man's mouth a plate of gold foil was occasionally tied, a custom reminiscent of burials at Mycenae, but also met surviving into the tenth century[7] at Tell Halaf (Gozan), a half-Aramaean city of North Syria, suggesting a remote echo of the passage of the Peoples of the Sea.[8] Hebrew traditions about the origins of the Philistines unanimously agree on their connexion with the Aegean world. In Genesis x. 14 (cf. I Chron. i. 12) they are said to be derived from Caphtor, son of Miṣraim (= Egypt) brother of Ludim (i.e. the Lydians) and various Egyptian and North African races —a highly possible allusion to the participation of the Peleset in

[1] §VII, 5, 154. Recent discoveries at Ashdod in the earliest Philistine levels have disclosed two things: first, its LH III 1c pottery can be in fact demonstrated by analysis of the clay to have been locally made (A, 4). Next, it is accompanied by the earliest form of Philistine ware, a white wash and bichrome pottery in which several later characteristic Philistine shapes are represented.

[2] §VII, 20.

[3] In an unpublished MS, to which the author kindly allowed me to refer.

[4] §VII, 5.

[5] §VII, 27; see also above p. 366, n. 4.

[6] §VII, 5; see below, pp. 510f. I am indebted to Mr E. Oren, who will shortly publish the Beth-shan cemetery, for this information and for his comments.

[7] §VII, 23.

[8] *Ibid.*

the Egyptian wars. But according to Amos (ix. 7), Deut. (ii. 23) and Jeremiah (xlvii. 4) their home was Caphtor, 'an island in the sea', certainly identifiable with the land *Kapturi* or *Kaptara* known from cuneiform texts,[1] and probably correctly identified with Crete, for Egyptians the home of the Keftiu,[2] an Aegean people often depicted in Eighteenth Dynasty tombs as foreigners bearing tribute. It is, however, conceivable, as argued by Wainwright, that Caphtor and the land of the Keftiu were Cilicia;[3] yet if so, how is it that Caphtor–Keftiu is never mentioned by the Hittites? Probably in Egypt and the Levant during the Eighteenth Dynasty Kaphtor became used as a generalized term for the Cretan–Mycenaean world. The word then seems to have gone largely out of use after the fall of Cnossus. The word *kaptōr* remains in Hebrew as a curious vestige that by the time of Exodus (xxv. 31–6, cf. Amos ix. 1) had come to mean for the Hebrews, doubtless borrowing it from the Phoenicians, an ornament perhaps in the form of a lily-flower or palmette, presumably originally of Aegean (Minoan) origin. Other origins, however, have been proposed for the Philistines:[4] Albright[5] returns to the old identification of them with the mysterious pre-Greek population called by the Greeks Pelasgians, assuming this name to be equated somehow with Peleset.

Archaeological finds, on the other hand, suggest that the immigration of the Philistines into Palestine was effected in two or even three stages. First come some settlements represented by tombs at Deir-el-Balaḥ and Beth-shan.[6] Then, about 1200 B.C., comes a period of invasions and burnings, e.g. at Megiddo and Ashdod. To about 1200 B.C. is to be dated the find in a sanctuary at Deir 'Allā of clay tablets bearing inscriptions in an unknown script of very Aegean appearance.[7] (This date is given by a broken faience vase found in the sanctuary bearing the cartouche of Queen Tawosret of Egypt.) After this comes the third stage: the Land and Sea Battles, followed by final Philistine settlements in Palestine to be described. There also seem to be increasing indications of Philistine connexions with some part of Cyprus. In

[1] E.g. §I, 12, vol. IV, 107, text 16238, 10. Kaphtor is also known in the Ras Shamra Texts, where it is called the residence of the artificer god, *Kṯr-w-Ḫss* (§I, 2, 110).

[2] §I, 17, 110 f.

[3] §IV, 19; §IV, 10; §IV, 21; §IV, 22; §IV, 23.

[4] E.g. by M. Müller, §VII, 22.

[5] See below, pp. 512 f.

[6] Bronze figures of men wearing feather head-dresses from sites in Syria and Phoenicia, e.g. H. T. Bossert, *Altsyrien* (1951), fig. 584, have been used in discussion of the Sea Peoples but evidently are unconnected with them.

[7] §VII, 11. See below, p. 510; above, p. 336.

the first place we have connexions indicated by the origin of Philistine ware, described above. Above this level were traces of Philistine 'squatters'. Ramesses III (1198–1166 B.C.) mentions among a list of his enemies several towns of Cyprus, *Srmsk* (Salamis), *Kṯn* (Kition), *'Imr* (Marion?), *Sr* (Soli), *Rtr* (Idalion). Ramesses III claims to have repulsed the *ṯk(k)r* (Tjekker),[1] a group identified on Egyptian reliefs as wearing a head-dress of a type described above,[2] commonly accepted as Philistine. One branch of this people certainly settled in strength at points on the coast of Phoenicia and Palestine, at Byblos and Dor, as is shown by the Tale of Wenamun, the Egyptian emissary from Thebes in the time of Smendes (early eleventh century B.C.), who is sent to buy cedar logs but brings back a long tale of woe.[3] But to connect the Tjekker with the Greek hero Teucros or Teucer of Salamis is very tempting. To Teucer is traditionally ascribed the foundation of Olba (Ura?) in Cilicia and Salamis in Cyprus. Tjekker appear to be already present in Enkomi (Salamis) even before its destruction at the turn of the thirteenth to twelfth century B.C., for late thirteenth-century vases from Enkomi Tomb 3 show men wearing what is apparently a headdress of 'Philistine' type, walking or riding in chariots.[4] The ivory gaming-box from Enkomi in the British Museum decorated in Mycenaean style shows a charioteering nobleman or king of Syrian type followed by a bearded Tjekker servant with 'Philistine' head-dress holding an axe.[5] In the ruins of the city of Enkomi of the twelfth century B.C., afterwards rebuilt, was found a stone seal engraved with figure of a warrior holding a large shield and again wearing the familiar 'Philistine' head-dress.[6] It may very well be that the Teucrians–Tjekker destroyed, rebuilt and ruled over the new Salamis. Thereafter, we find that in Cyprus the Philistine type of boat, ending in a duck's head, continued in use there till the seventh or sixth century, as depicted on a vase.[7]

The Tjekker were, it would seem, not the only group of Sea Peoples to live, or to gain a foothold, in Cyprus. A splendid bronze statuette of a god wearing a felt or fur helmet with huge horns somewhat resembling the Sherden type was discovered at Enkomi by Dikaios in 1952.[8] In 1963 other statuettes with horned helmets were discovered, one holding a spear and round

[1] §I, 4, vol. IV, 24–5 and 75–6. [2] §VI, 8; §III, 3. See above, pp. 372 f.
[3] §I, 13, 25 ff. [4] §VI, 7, fig. 19 and fig. 10.
[5] A. S. Murray, A. H. Smith and H. B. Walters, *Excavations in Cyprus* (1900), pl. I. [6] §VI, 2, fig. 11.
[7] Unpublished, in National Museum, Cyprus. [8] §VI, 2; A, I.

shield standing on a model of an ingot.[1] Such figures tempt us to suggest not only that the Sherden came to Egypt from Cyprus, but that there were other Sea Peoples there too. In the Great Harris Papyrus, Ramesses III declares:[2] 'I extended all the frontiers of Egypt and overthrew those who had attacked them from their lands. I slew the Denyen [who are] in their islands, while the Tjekker and the Peleset were made ashes. The Sherden and the Weshesh of the Sea were made non-existent, taken captive all together and brought in captivity to Egypt like the sands of the shore. I settled them in strongholds bound in my name. The military classes were as numerous as hundred-thousands. I assigned portions for them all with clothing and provisions from the treasuries and granaries every year.' As for the 'Weshesh of the Sea', there is little to be said. Axos in Crete (spelt *Waxos* on its coinage) and Iasus or Iassos (also spelt Ouassos in inscriptions) in S.W. Caria have been suggested.[3] But this proclamation gives us an explicit clue that the invading Denyen–Danuniyim at least came through the Aegean islands; possibly also through Cyprus, and evidence may be plausibly seen in the Assyrian name for Cyprus in the eighth century B.C.,[4] Yadnana, to be interpreted as 'ia-danana, 'Isle (or Coast) of the Danana', though no archaeological proof of Danuna settlement in Cyprus has so far been found. Very possibly Aspendus in Pamphylia was an outlying settlement of theirs, since its native name as given on its coins was *Estwedi*, apparently identical with the name of *Azitawata*, king of the city at Karatepe. In Eastern Cilicia, however, their old home, the Denyen lived on, as we have seen, into the ninth century B.C., strong enough to cause alarm to their neighbour across the Amanus, Kalamu of Sam'al,[5] and to be a thorn in his flesh. Whatever their original racial affinities, both groups were by then alike Semitized in speech though largely Anatolian in culture.

The outcome of the war between Egypt and the Sea Raiders is well known. Ramesses III claims to have utterly defeated them and suggestions that he and his successors settled groups of Peleset (Philistine) mercenary garrisons in Beth-shan in Palestine are demonstrated by the finds there of 'Sea People' burials. Others are found at Tell el-Fār'ah. He further seems to have given over to their care the four Canaanite cities of Gaza, Askalon, Ashdod and Dor, occupied by the Tjekker, as is made clear by Wenamon's

[1] §VI, 5. [2] §I, 13, 262. [3] See §III, 3, 71, n. 3.

[4] D. D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*, §§54, 70, 80, 82, 92, 96–9, 102, 186, 188 (Sargon II); §690, 709–10 (Esarhaddon).

[5] §IV, 15.

report. (Two more cities, Gath and Ekron in the plain to the east, were occupied by them and formed with Gaza, Askalon and Ashdod a league of five cities ruled by *seranim*.)[1] One may perhaps wonder if the pharaoh's victory was as crushing as he suggests or whether, as was his wont, he is protesting too much; whether in fact it was not a Pyrrhic victory. The Peleset hordes were indeed prevented from entering Egypt, if such was their intention, but whether by treaty or tacit consent of the pharaoh were able to settle unhindered in the fertile Shephelah or coastal plain of Palestine,[2] to which they have given their name ever since, commanding the 'going out from Egypt', the *Via Maris*, and forcing the pharaohs to abandon their claims—maintained since the Eighteenth Dynasty—to sovereignty over Palestine. Egypt thereupon withdrew upon herself and a new phase of the history of the Near East was begun.

[1] The Egyptian *Onomasticon* of Amenemope, *c.* 1100 B.C. (see §1, 6)—a kind of gazetteer—mentions Shardana, Tjekker and Philistines after naming the cities of Askalon, Ashdod and Gaza.

[2] §7, 26. See also W. F. Albright, 'An Anthropoid Clay Coffin from Sahab in Trans-Jordan', in *A.J.A.* 36 (1932), 295 ff.

CHAPTER XXXIII

SYRIA, THE PHILISTINES, AND PHOENICIA

I. THE SEA PEOPLES IN PALESTINE

In the early twelfth century B.C. Syria and Palestine were flooded by an irruption of peoples from the coasts and islands of the northern Mediterranean. Unfortunately, we cannot fix the exact date of this invasion, since our chief pertinent sources are the reliefs and accompanying inscriptions of Ramesses III at Medīnet Habu; the former are schematic and undated, while the latter consist almost exclusively of triumphal poems in a stereotyped and bombastic style.[1] Moreover, the date of the reign of Ramesses III is uncertain within a possible range of a generation and a probable range of a decade, but the earliest and latest possible dates for his accession are now considered to have been about 1205 and 1180, respectively. To judge from the monuments, it would appear that the first attack[2] on Egypt came by sea and land not long before the sixth year of the king. The first land onslaught is said to have been beaten back in Phoenicia (*Djahy*). The great triumphal inscription of the eighth year was composed in glorification of the second naval victory; land operations are also mentioned, but it is not clear how successful they really were.[3]

While the inscription of the eighth year makes it certain that the Egyptians connected this migration with the movement which had brought an abrupt end to the Hittite Empire, it seems evident that they were both part of a greater upheaval. The Hittite Empire was overthrown by land peoples who struck deep into the heart of Anatolia and are said in the inscriptions of the Assyrian king Tiglath-pileser I to have reached south-western Armenia about 1165 B.C. The migration with which we are concerned here included five different peoples, at least two of whom are represented as fighting in ships, some manned by warriors with feathered helmets[4] while others have only warriors with low, horned helmets.

* An original version of this chapter was published as fascicle 51 in 1966.

[1] §I, 39, 24 ff. [2] See above, pp. 241 f.

[3] §I, 14, 53 ff. The phrase *iryw šdt m nꜣysn iww* should probably be rendered: '(As for the foreign countries,) they were making a (plundering) raid from their islands'—see *G*, 5, vol. 4, 561. [4] See, however, above, p. 372.

All of the warriors in the scenes of land-fighting wear feathered helmets. The land-forces of the invaders employ chariots for fighting and heavy two-wheeled carts drawn by humped oxen for women and children. The use of carts suggests a long overland journey but by no means proves it, since they may have been constructed after arrival in Palestine by sea.[1]

The identification of the five peoples listed in the texts of Ramesses III has long been vigorously debated. In the order of importance indicated by the number and character of the allusions to them, they are the Peleset (*Pr/lst*), the Tjekker (*Tjik[k]al/r*), the Sheklesh (*Shekr/lushe*), the Denyen (*Danuna*), and the Weshesh (*Washeshe*).[2] The first people is undoubtedly to be identified with the biblical Philistines, of whom more below. The second is perhaps to be identified with the Teucrians (or less probably with the Homeric Sikeloi, who occupied Sicily and gave their name to the island).[3] The third seems to be unknown otherwise; all proposed identifications are dubious. The fourth is unquestionably to be identified somehow with the land Danuna of a letter of Abi-milki, prince of Tyre in the Amarna period; the name later appears in Cyprus as the *Yad(a)nana* of the Assyrians[4] and in Cilicia as the land of the *Dnnym*.[5] The Washeshe are unknown unless their name is connected with Carian Ouassos. That all these peoples came from somewhere in the Aegean orbit appears reasonably certain. It is significant that the two distinctive types of helmet at Medīnet Habu appear at about the same time on the so-called warrior-vase from Mycenae.[6] On the vase are two processions of five warriors each; one group wears feathered helmets and the other horned helmets. However, the horned helmet is high, with plumes floating from the crest; it is different from both the low horned helmet of the Mediterranean allies at Medīnet Habu and from the crested, horned helmet worn by the Sherden (Shardina), i.e. Sardinian, corps of the Egyptian army itself (shown at Medīnet Habu only when joining with the Egyptians in land operations).

[1] The account in §1, 14, 53 ff. is insufficiently detailed to allow any clear reconstruction of the sequence of events.

[2] For the vocalization see §1, 4, *passim*, and §1, 23, 240 ff.

[3] The vocalization *Tjikar* agrees very well with *Teukr-*; cf. Hebrew *s[u]ran-* (which would be written approximately **tju-ra-n* in New Egyptian) and its later Greek equivalent *turann-*. Teucrians are said in Greek sources to have settled at Salamis in Cyprus after the Trojan War. See above, pp. 276 f.

[4] §1, 5, 171 ff.

[5] *Ibid.* 172. See above, pp. 363 ff.

[6] §1, 8, figs. 265 ff. The differences in shape seem largely to be the result of artistic conventions.

Our knowledge of the archaeological and historical background of Philistine culture is now substantial. It is quite certain that the highly distinctive 'Philistine' pottery found in such quantities in Philistine sites as well as in the towns of the adjacent lowland country (Shephelah) of Judah in deposits of the twelfth and eleventh centuries B.C. has been correctly identified. It springs directly from the LH III C I ware of the Aegean basin, and its manufacture seems to have been brought from Cyprus to Palestine not later than the early twelfth century, judging from the remarkable likeness of specifically Philistine pottery to pieces found by A. Furumark at Sinda and by C. F. A. Schaeffer and P. Dikaios at Enkomi, both in north-eastern Cyprus near Salamis.[1] This ware has been called by Furumark LH III C I b and assigned to the period between *c.* 1225 and 1175 B.C. It shows Cypriot influence, so there is good reason to reject the view that it was brought by the Philistines directly from their Aegean home.

Since the inscriptions of Ramesses III repeatedly speak of using captives as troops in his own army and since some of the Sea Peoples (especially the Sherden) had been used as mercenaries or as slave troops during the reign of Ramesses II, many scholars now agree that the Philistines were first settled in Palestine as garrison troops. This has been demonstrated on the basis of the virtual identity of weapons, anthropoid clay sarcophagi, and other artifacts in garrison sites from Beth-shan in the northern Jordan valley to Tell el-Fār'ah in the Negeb of western Palestine, as well as at Tell Nebesha in the Delta and Anība in Nubia.[2] In Philistia proper both Ashdod and Gath have been shown by recent excavations to have been originally fortresses of the *Zwingburg* type; Gath is still most probably to be found at the traditional site of Tel Gat (Tell esh-Sheikh el-'Areini) despite the excavator's doubts, for the alternative site (Tell en-Nejīleh) has yielded no Late Bronze remains, and Ashdod was a similar large fortress in early Philistine times. Another fortress may have been the third Philistine inland town, Ekron.[3] Gaza, and Askalon were already, by contrast, important seaports before the Philistine occupation began.

Evidence for the date of the original establishment of the

[1] §I, 11, 209 f.; for the best previous study see §I, 24, and cf. §I, 7 (1954 and later editions), 114 f. Since some Philistines had probably settled in eastern Cyprus several decades before their occupation of the Pentapolis, this chronological situation would be expected.

[2] §I, 12; 13.

[3] J. Naveh's identification (§I, 28) of Ekron with the large (but poorly fortified) site of Khirbet al-Muqanna' is impossible for a number of reasons, and the site of 'Aqir again becomes highly probable.

Philistines in key fortresses was uncovered by Petrie and Starkey (1927–30) at Tell el-Fār'ah (Sharuhen), and still more important clues have more recently been found by H. J. Franken at Tell Deir 'Allā (Succoth) some 24 miles south of Beth-shan in the Jordan valley. At Sharuhen the fortified 'Residency' yielded early Philistine pottery in a structure first built by Sethos II (1216–1210 B.C.), as demonstrated by the find of four very large and heavy sherds belonging to a massive jar inscribed in well-carved hieroglyphs with the name of Sethos II.[1] Since these sherds, though found in different places in the 'Residency', fit together, it seems clear that the original jar dates from the foundation of the fortress by Sethos II, who is known from other sources to have built such fortresses in the region between the Delta and southern Palestine. It follows that the Philistines were settled here as garrison troops at some time between the foundation of this Egyptian fortress and its destruction in the latter part of the twelfth century.

The Deir 'Allā finds are much more remarkable, though not entirely unexpected.[2] On the floor of a sanctuary from the end of the Late Bronze Age, about 1200 B.C., was found a broken faience bowl inscribed with the cartouche of Queen Tewosret, who reigned in the last decade of the thirteenth century B.C. In the same occupation level, 8 m. east of the sanctuary, were found (in 1964) three inscribed tablets and a discarded fourth tablet in two rooms containing the same kinds of pottery.[3] Though the sanctuary is said to have been destroyed by an earthquake, Philistine pottery is reported to have been found in the same stratum and, according to information, is to be dated immediately after the time of the tablets.[4] These contain over fifty characters, grouped into some fifteen words separated by vertical strokes; they resemble elongated Minoan Linear A and B tablets, and some of the characters closely resemble signs of Minoan Linear A though simplified in form and reduced in number. Apparently we have to do with a purely phonetic syllabary, analogous to the Cypriot and in part to the Carian. That the tablets are very early Philistine texts is highly probable, though they might represent the script of some other Sea People.

Decisive evidence has now been found identifying the occupants of the anthropoid sarcophagi of Beth-shan with the

[1] §I, 36, 28 and §I, 32, 18 (which Starkey seems to have overlooked).
[2] §I, 7, 185 (1954 ed.).
[3] §III, 19.
[4] See above, p. 336.

Philistines of the Medīnet Habu reliefs of Ramesses III.[1] The faces moulded on the cover pieces of the Beth-shan coffins are surmounted by feathered helmets of the same types as we find attributed to the Philistines at Medīnet Habu, with identical decoration around the lower part of the helmets: (1) a horizontal strip with a single row of little circular projections; (2) a horizontal strip with two similar rows of circular projections; (3) a similar strip with a row of chevrons or zigzag decoration above and a row of circular projections below. A fourth modification appears at Medīnet Habu but not at Beth-shan (where the material is incomparably more limited in amount): a strip with a single row of zigzag or chevron decoration. In view of the way in which the pre-Hellenic and early Hellenic peoples were subdivided into three or more tribes (e.g. the Rhodians were divided into three tribes according to the Homeric Catalogue of Ships) we may rest assured that the insignia in question indicate tribal ties, not military rank. In other words, they correspond very roughly with the *wusūm* marks of the Arabs, but they undoubtedly reflect a much higher level of socio-political organization.

The foregoing data establish the fact that there was an early phase of military garrisons manned by Philistines (and quite possibly by other Sea Peoples), which was followed by a large-scale invasion by sea and land, repulsed by Ramesses III early in the twelfth century. The Philistines and their allies were driven back from Egypt proper but were allowed to settle in Palestine as Egyptian vassals. The Philistines occupied the coastal plain from south of Gaza to north of Ekron; south of them there may have been a Cretan colony,[2] and in northern Sharon the Tjekker were settled, as we know from the Wenamun report. Other groups may have been settled in southern Sharon (the 'Auja valley and Joppa) and the plain of Acre, all of which passed under Philistine control before the second half of the eleventh century B.C. The methodical way in which the Sea Peoples appear to have divided up the coast of Palestine is clear from even a superficial geographical analysis of their division. The Philistines themselves, being the dominant group in the confederation, took the best territory. Though only about 40 miles long and averaging little over 15 miles in width, the Philistine Pentapolis had approximately the same area as the whole of Attica; moreover, most of its land was cultivable, producing splendid crops of grain in normal seasons. In due course they absorbed their Cretan neighbours to the south and expanded northwards to dominate the

[1] §1, 12, 57 and much more briefly §1, 13, 156 ff. [2] §1, 1 and §1, 2, 136 ff.

plain of Sharon. The report of Wenamun, from the early eleventh century B.C., tells us that the Tjekker were then occupying Dor, which probably included not less than 30 miles of sea coast just south of Carmel. This tract, however, is so much narrower and less adapted to agriculture than the Philistine plain that one is scarcely surprised to learn that the Tjekker were still noted for piracy a century or more after their settlement. Between these two areas of settlement is a shorter zone around Joppa and Apollonia (Arsuf), only some 30 by 15 miles in extent, but extraordinarily rich and well watered; we do not know which of the Sea Peoples settled there at first, but it later passed under Philistine control. Nor do we know which people was allotted the rich plain of Acre, or whether any of them settled still farther north on the Syrian coast.

Who were the Philistines originally? Biblical tradition, clearly derived from Philistine sources, brings them from Caphtor (Akkadian *Kaptara*, Crete) and this tradition is supported by the appellation *Minoa* given to Gaza. Just south of Gaza was a Cretan settlement,[1] and David employed 'light-armed' Cretans as mercenaries.[2] As noted above, the Deir 'Allā tablets are written in a script with clear affinities to Minoan A (though greatly evolved and simplified), and the Phaestus disk from a sixteenth-century Cretan palace has a frequently appearing character portraying a male head with feathered headdress. On the other hand, the Lydian tradition as reported by the native historian Xanthus (a contemporary of Herodotus) claims that the Philistines were colonists from Lydia.[3] This conflict of opinion presumably arose from considerations of prestige; the Philistines themselves, before Gyges made Lydia world-famous, claimed Cretan origin, while the Lydians claimed the Philistines as former colonists of theirs.

In 1950–1 a new element was introduced into this previously insoluble debate; the old equation of Philistines and Pelasgians was taken up again,[4] and good evidence was presented for an

[1] See preceding note.

[2] Hebrew *Keretī u-pelētī*, 'Cherethites and Pelethites', is the common designation of David's favourite bodyguard. Since the Lucianic recension of the Septuagint (now known from Qumrān Cave 4 to be exceptionally reliable) offers a reading *pheltei*, we may be justified in treating the expression as a typical Semitic hendiadys, in which case the second word **peltī* might be derived from the Aegean source of later Greek *peltē*, 'light shield' (from which comes *peltastēs*, 'light-armed warrior'). The Cretans were known as archers in classical times.

[3] G, 11, 81, n. 1.

[4] See §111, 6, 4; and V. Georgiev in *Jahrbuch für kleinasiatische Forschung*, 1 (1951), 136 ff.

ancient variant *Pelastikon*, etc., for *Pelasgikon*, both of which presumably went back to an older form with a consonant found by the Hellenes difficult to pronounce. Unfortunately, Greek tradition about the Pelasgians is so confused that Eduard Meyer was inclined to reject it almost entirely.[1] This goes much too far, and we have some evidence from Greek sources which seems relatively accurate. According to Homer (Iliad II, 840) the southern Troad was inhabited by 'spear-brandishing Pelasgians', and Herodotus, who was a native of Halicarnassus in Caria, traces both the Ionians and the Aeolians to Pelasgian origins. It is more than likely that his 'Coastal Pelasgians' actually preceded the Ionians in Ionia, not in the Peloponnesus as he states.[2] There is also much confusion in our sources between the Tyrrhenians (Tursha in the lists of Sea Peoples) of Lemnos in the Aegean and the Pelasgians.[3] However this may be, we have onomastic data which confirm the derivation of the Philistines from the general area of south-western Asia Minor. The only certain Philistine names until recently were Goliath (*Golyaṯ*) and Achish (correctly *Ekaush*, or the like), but we also have three names of Philistine chieftains or merchant princes in the Wenamun report: Waraktir (*Wr/lktr/l*), Waret (*Wr/lt*) and Makamar (*Mkmr/l*).[4] It was suggested in 1951 that their names were South-west Anatolian (i.e. Luwian),[5] and this suggestion was confirmed independently in 1962.[6] Perhaps the details should be slightly modified and the names be explained tentatively as *Warkat/dara*, *Ward/ta* and *Mag/kamola*, all with excellent equivalents in the daughter dialects of Luwian (Lycian, Carian, Pisidian, Pamphylian and Cilician, etc.).[7] Heb. *Golyaṯ* was long ago identified with Lydian *Alyattes*, older *Walwatta*; the reciprocal dissimilation offers no problems, and the element *walwi* as well as the formation *walwatta* are both well illustrated in Luwian.[8] In short, the Philistines may be identified with Pelasgians of some kind, and their language was a Luwian dialect.[9]

[1] E.g. G, 11, 237, n. 1. [2] Herodotus, VII, 94. [3] Most recently §1, 19, 224.

[4] Only the consonants are known with certainty, since the syllabic orthography had become hopelessly confused by the eleventh century B.C.

[5] §1, 6. [6] §1, 20, 50, n. 25.

[7] On the Luwian daughter-dialects see §1, 37, and on Lydian and its relationship to Luwian see §1, 10.

[8] §1, 20, 49; cf. such pairs as *muwa* and *Muwatta* as well as Lydian *walwes* (*ibid.*, n. 21).

[9] An obvious further deduction would be that these Pelasgians spoke a Luwian dialect, but we do not know enough about the Pelasgians to make such a facile generalization—they may have been a multilingual federation for all we know.

As already indicated, the occupation of the coastland of Palestine by the Sea Peoples was attended by much destruction of Canaanite towns. Ramesses III tells us that Canaanite princes and patrician charioteers (*mryn*, *mariyanna*) joined the Egyptian commanders in resisting the foes. It appears that there were successive raids during the generation or more (possibly as much as fifty years) which preceded the mass invasion in the eighth year of Ramesses III. The excavators of Ashdod are inclined to date the destruction of the Late Bronze town about the same time as the Israelite conquest of the Shephelah.[1] Askalon shows clear remains of a destruction level between Canaanite and Philistine levels. Gath (Tell Gat) and Tell el-Qasīleh on the Yarqōn river were not founded until after the irruption of the Sea Peoples, and Dor seems to exhibit the same picture that we find at Askalon. Much farther north Ugarit was destroyed soon after the beginning of the Mediterranean raids. Publication of the documents from the Tablet Oven,[2] excavated in 1954, provides a solid basis for dating the fall of Ugarit, which must have occurred within a very short time after the tablets were placed in the oven. Two letters are particularly important: RS 18.38 and RS 18.40. The former contains the text (or translation) of a message sent to 'Ammurapi, last king of Ugarit, from his Hittite suzerain (probably Tudkhaliash IV). It states that 'The enemy has come up against me, the As[syr]ian', using the familiar Ugaritic and Aramaic consonantal spelling of the name. The second letter, written by an Ugaritic official to the king of Ugarit, says that he is in Lawasanda (Lawazantiya),[3] watching the approaches from the east together with the king of Siannu.[4] The latter 'has fled and...was killed'.

The events mentioned in these letters correspond with happenings in the first full year of Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria, whose troops crossed the Euphrates and carried off '28,800 men of Khatti' as captives. Since the destruction of Ugarit did not occur until after the accession of Merneptah, we must fix the accession of his father, Ramesses II, in 1304 instead of in 1290, but at the same time we must date the Assyrian invasion of Syria in 1234 instead of in 1244. The fall of Ugarit then took place in 1234—probably a few months after the victory of Merneptah over the

[1] Personal information.

[2] In Ch. Virolleaud, *Textes en cunéiformes alphabétiques des Archives Sud, Sud-Ouest, et du Petit Palais* (*Le Palais royal d'Ugarit V = Mission de Ras Shamra XI*). Paris, 1965.

[3] As identified by Mr M. Astour.

[4] So clearly to be read on a photograph supplied by M. Schaeffer.

Libyans and Sea Peoples in the spring of 1234, possibly in 1233 or 1232. The city was not destroyed by an Assyrian army but probably by a sudden raid of the Sea Peoples at a time when the Ugaritic navy had been sent by the Hittites to another area—perhaps Lycia, as explicitly stated in one tablet.

The destruction of Tyre is presupposed by tradition and that of Sidon (at the hands of a king of Askalon) is explicitly mentioned.[1] In the Shephelah of Judah (especially at Beth-shemesh and Tell Beit Mirsim) there is a gap of a generation or more between the latest imports of Mycenaean pottery (which immediately preceded the disruption of trade by the Sea Peoples during the reign of Merneptah) and the introduction of Philistine pottery from the Coastal Plain.

After the death of Ramesses III the Philistines and their congeners appear to have concentrated on sea and land trade. A century later, not long before the Philistine conquest of Palestine, the Tjekker were still more powerful at sea than the prince of Byblos, and the Philistine prince Waraktir (Warkatara) was in trade alliance (*khubūr*) with Sidon.[2] Since there is no good evidence of any Phoenician overseas colonization before the tenth century B.C., it is practically certain that the Philistines and other Sea Peoples of Palestine controlled the waters of the south-eastern Mediterranean until their defeat by the combined forces of Israel and Tyre early in the same century. Land trade was greatly facilitated by the fact that the Philistines already occupied a number of strategic points in the plain of Esdraelon and the Jordan valley (especially Beth-shan and Succoth) in the period immediately preceding the mass invasion under Ramesses III. The influence of the Philistines on desert trade is illustrated by the discovery at Saḥāb, east of ʻAmmān, of an Early Iron Age tomb containing a typical anthropoid clay coffin.[3] The conquest of Israel by the Philistines about the middle of the eleventh century was perhaps dictated mainly by the increasing need of protection for caravans from the desert. It must be remembered that this was less than a century after the great Midianite raids, in which camel-riding raiders appeared for the first known time in the history of south-western Asia. Soon after these raids we find

[1] G, 11, 79 ff.

[2] §1, 6, 229 ff., and B. Maisler (Mazar) in *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 102 (1946), 9 ff. See also §11, 5, 359, n. 80. It may be observed that 'partnership' is *ment-shbēr* in Coptic; *shbēr* is the normal Coptic equivalent of Eg. *ḫbr* (*khubūr*), itself a loan-word from Semitic.

[3] See W. F. Albright in *A.J.A.* 36 (1932), 295 ff.

the state of Ammon beginning to make forays into Israelite territory.[1] The very existence of Ammon was dependent on caravan trade with the desert, and the ethnic composition of the Ammonites in the following centuries, as known from proper names on seals, etc., was partly north-west Semitic, partly Arab.[2]

The organization of the Philistine 'empire' was also clearly dictated by the interests of a trading confederacy. So far as we know, the Philistines were always governed by their five 'lords', meeting in council; the word is found in Hebrew only in the plural, *s^erānīm*[3] or *sarney P^elishtīm* (which is usually identified with pre-Hellenic *turan(nos)*, 'tyrant', and compared with Tyrrhenian *turan*, 'lady'). The coastal members of the larger confederation marshalled their forces at Aphek above the source of the 'Auja river north-east of Joppa; this well-watered base of operations, midway between Philistine and Tjekker territory, was admirably suited for the purpose and again illustrates the autonomy of the different Sea Peoples about the middle and just before the close of the eleventh century. Two other items may be cited to illustrate the nature of the Philistine 'empire'. It has been pointed out that the solidly and symmetrically constructed late-eleventh century fortress at Gibeah of Benjamin must be attributed to the Philistines, who had actually built a fortress at Gibeah according to 1 Sam. x. 5.[4] The existence of such fortresses constructed at key points along trade-routes would naturally indicate a high degree of organization. The establishment of an iron monopoly in Palestine (1 Sam. xiii. 19–22), after the earlier Hittite model, served the double purpose of limiting Israelite use of iron weapons and increasing industrial profits. Apparently the Philistine smiths were organized into a guild, like the earlier guilds of Ugarit.[5]

II. THE CANAANITE REVIVAL IN PHOENICIA

Between the late thirteenth and the end of the twelfth century B.C., the territory occupied by the Canaanites was vastly reduced. In

[1] On the early history of Ammon see W. F. Albright in *Miscellanea Biblica B. Ubach* (Montserrat, 1954), 131 ff.; and §1, 25, 66 ff.

[2] In addition to the material already mentioned, cf. my note in *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 160 (1960), 41, n. 25*a*.

[3] The original Hebrew vowel of the first syllable is quite unknown and may just as well have been *u* as *a*; *sarney* is a secondary formation.

[4] See §1, 27, 13, n. 19 and G, 2, 50. See also L. A. Sinclair, in *Bi. Ar.* 27 (1964), 56.

[5] See §1, 27, 10 and 13, and for other details concerning the Philistines §1, 7, 114 ff. See above, p. 136.

the Late Bronze Age the entire coast of Syria from Mount Casius to the Egyptian frontier had been inhabited by a mixed people sharing a common language (with minor dialectal differences) and a common culture and religion. Inland this was also true to varying degrees; the narrowest belts of 'Canaanite' territory were in Ugarit and Palestine, and the widest eastward extension was in Phoenicia proper, where it stretched across Lebanon at least as far as Anti-Lebanon. First came the Israelites, occupying practically all the hill-country of western Palestine and much of Bashan (Ḥaurān).[1] The Sea Peoples then occupied the coast of Palestine and possibly coastal areas north of Phoenicia. About the same time came the Aramaeans, sweeping over eastern and northern Syria to establish a culture oriented northward and eastward rather than southward and westward. As a result the Canaanites suffered the loss of half their coast and virtually the entire hinterland except for Lebanon, where almost impenetrable mountain forests blocked aggression from the east. In all they must have lost a good three-fourths of their territory and at least nine-tenths of their grain land.

However, there were compensations for these losses. The coast of Phoenicia proper was ideally prepared by nature to become the home of a maritime people. It is true that there were few harbours like that of Berytus, but in those simple days small natural or artificial breakwaters were sufficient to protect most ships against storms. Two of the five leading Phoenician cities, Tyre and Aradus (Arvad), were on islands; they were thus impregnable fortresses as long as they controlled the sea. The remaining three, Sidon, Berytus and Byblos, were on the mainland; it is scarcely an accident that none of the three had the political significance in the middle centuries of the Iron Age that was possessed by Tyre and Aradus. In the Late Bronze Age, as we know from the Amarna Letters and Papyrus Anastasi No. I,[2] Tyre was dependent on the mainland for its supply of fresh water. From the twelfth century onwards this dependence was greatly reduced; the rapid spread of watertight cisterns about the beginning of the Iron Age[3] explains not only the sudden expansion of settlement throughout the hill-country of Palestine in early Israelite times, but also the similar development of settlement over Mount Lebanon in the same period. This consequent increase in native population provided a substantial part of the

[1] Data mentioned above, pp. 514 f., make it probable that the critical phase of the Israelite conquest was nearly contemporary with the beginning of the Philistine raids.

[2] *C.A.H.* II[1], 326.

[3] §II, 5, 341 and 358, n. 72.

personnel needed to man the merchant fleets and colonize the Phoenician trading settlements in the Mediterranean.[1]

Another factor of great importance in the development of Phoenician maritime power was the destruction of the Hittite Empire in the late thirteenth century B.C.,[2] which ended any serious threat from Anatolia to the growth of Phoenician enterprise. After the death of Ramesses III, Egypt soon ceased to be either an actual or a potential danger. During most of the twelfth century Assyria was unable to expand west of the Euphrates. The brief interlude of expansion under Tiglath-pileser I and his sons, at the end of the twelfth and during the first decades of the eleventh century, can scarcely have constituted a direct threat to southern Phoenicia; in any case it soon passed and it was two centuries before Assyrian power again menaced Phoenicia. Moreover, the collapse of Mycenaean sea power during the late thirteenth century relieved the Phoenicians of any serious threat from the west except the perpetual menace of piratic attacks from the Sea Peoples.

Still another factor contributing to Phoenician maritime expansion may be mentioned: the rapid spread of iron after the fall of the Hittite Empire, which had monopolized it. In the sixth century Babylonian economic texts mention iron from Mount Lebanon, and it seems likely that the Phoenicians had long before discovered these deposits, traces of which still remain. Through trade with Asia Minor it soon became easy to obtain iron, which came into use for ordinary tools in the course of the eleventh century. Iron was far better adapted than copper or bronze for making axe-heads, adze-heads, saws and sledge-hammers; it was also much cheaper, once the markets were opened and the arts of smelting and forging iron had been developed. With the new tools came a great expansion in the use of the fine timber of Lebanon for ship construction. Larger beams and boards could now be manufactured much more cheaply.[3]

The devastation of the Phoenician coast by the Sea Peoples in the late thirteenth and early twelfth centuries B.C. must have virtually ended normal economic development. The Sidonians and the Byblians were the first to recover. The ancient rivalry

[1] For early Israelite participation in Phoenician shipping see e.g. Judg. v. 17 (twelfth century), Gen. xlix. 13 (eleventh century), 2 Kings x. 22 ff. (tenth century), etc.

[2] It is now virtually certain that this event took place much earlier than is commonly supposed.

[3] §III, 16, on the early development of the Phoenician merchant marine.

between Tyre and Sidon had been brought to a temporary halt by the destruction of both cities, followed by the rebuilding of Tyre as a Sidonian town.[1] Thenceforward, until the late eighth century, we find 'Sidonian' used in the Bible, the Homeric Epics, and native inscriptions as a term covering the South Phoenicians in general.[2] Ittoba'al I of Tyre (*c.* 887–856) appears in the Bible as 'king of the Sidonians'; over a century later Hiram II of Tyre (so entitled in the Assyrian inscriptions) is called 'king of the Sidonians' in a native inscription dedicated to Ba'al-Lebanon; Elulaeus (*c.* 701) is called 'king of Tyre' by Menander, but 'king of Sidon' in the Assyrian inscriptions (which say, however, that his residence was in Tyre, while Menander says that Sidon was separated from Tyre by the Assyrians). In late Sidonian coins Sidon receives the Phoenician appellation 'mother of Kambe (Carthage), Hippo, Citium and Tyre,' which sufficiently attests the fact that Sidon claimed Tyre and its chief colonies as its own daughters. From these and other data it appears certain that Tyre and Sidon formed part of a single Sidonian state in the twelfth to tenth centuries. Similarly, it is probable that Berytus, which is never mentioned in the Bible or the Assyrian inscriptions, was part of the Byblian state.

After more than a hundred years of complete darkness, the report of Wenamun casts a bright light on Phoenicia at the end of the Twentieth Dynasty under Ramesses XI (1100–1085 B.C.).[3] The Egyptian threat to Asia had ceased, as the king of Byblos delighted in reminding the unfortunate Egyptian envoy. The Tjekker, who had settled in Dor (see above), were feared as pirates. The southern coast of Cyprus, far from being under Phoenician domination, was ruled by an independent queen, whose subjects were allegedly about to put Wenamun and his Byblian sailors to death when the extant portion of the narrative comes to an end. Most illuminating is the description of the organization of Phoenician shipping at that time. Zakarba'al, king of Byblos, says to Wenamun, after scolding him for coming in a second-rate ship with an unreliable captain: 'There are twenty *mnš*[4] ships here in my harbour which are in trading association[5] with Smendes (the first Tanite pharaoh), and even in Sidon, which you passed, there must be fifty *br* ships[6] which are in association

[1] G, 11, 79 ff.
[2] §11, 5, 347 ff.
[3] §1, 6. The Wenamun report is 'a real report', not a literary work as formerly believed; see §11, 11, 41, n. 8 and §11, 12, 22. See below, pp. 641 ff.
[4] §1, 14, 54, n. 206.
[5] See above, p. 515, n. 2
[6] §1, 14, 54, n. 206. See also §1, 27, 3 ff.

with Waraktir (Warkatara)[1] and are carrying (freight) to his residence.' Here again the reference to Sidon evidently includes Tyre and other ports of the Sidonians, since Tyre itself was mentioned in passing earlier in the same narrative. It follows from the words of Zakarba'al that it was then customary to organize syndicates of trading vessels under the protection of powerful foreign princes, such as Smendes of Tanis and Waraktir (Warkatara, of Askalon?), with whom profits were shared. The reason for such organization of shipping is not far to seek; the syndicates provided both the necessary capital with which to build and fit out trading fleets and the protection against piracy without which they could not have plied their trade. Centuries later the same expression was employed in Hebrew in connexion with the formation of syndicates and trading guilds.

That the word 'Phoenician' (Greek *Phoinix*) was derived from *phoinix*, 'red purple dye', was well known in antiquity, though it has often been denied in modern times. It has been deduced from fifteenth-century documents found at Nuzi that the word 'Canaan' is also derived from an older word for 'purple dye',[2] after which it was shown that the Hebrew word *kᵉna'anī*, 'merchant', was already used in this sense as early as the fifteenth century B.C. and that 'Canaanite' meant properly 'dealer in purple dye', i.e. 'textile merchant'.[3] As late as the time of Job (probably seventh century B.C.) the word *ḥabbār*, 'member of a trading association' (*ḥubūr*), still appears as a synonym of *kᵉna'anī*, 'merchant'. These facts illustrate the basic importance of trade in the Phoenician economy, an importance which was interrupted only temporarily by the crises of the late thirteenth and early twelfth centuries B.C.

It is characteristic of Phoenician as well as of Philistine organization that the power of the king tended to be kept in check by the 'elders', who met as a kind of senate in order to consider matters of importance to the state. In the Amarna Tablets we already have a council of elders (*šībūtu*) at Arce (Irqata) in central Phoenicia.[4] In the Wenamun report Zakarba'al of Byblos called the state council (here designated by the well-known Hebrew term *mō'ēḏ*)[5] in order to consider the demand of the Tjekker envoys for the extradition of Wenamun. In later times the council of state still formed an integral part of the constitutions of Tyre, Byblos

[1] See above, pp. 513, 515.
[2] *Language*, 12, 121 ff.
[3] B. Maisler in *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 102 (1946), 7 ff. Cf. §II, 5, 356, n. 50.
[4] Amarna tablet 100, 4. My collation has confirmed this reading.
[5] See A. J. Wilson in *J.N.E.S.* 4 (1945), 245.

and Carthage, as we know from Assyrian, Hebrew and Greek sources of the seventh to third centuries B.C.

Epigraphic material throwing light on Phoenician history is relatively plentiful during the Late Bronze Age, but after the fall of Ugarit in the late thirteenth century it becomes very scanty indeed. The earliest of these texts (aside from a few names and the word *ḥeṣ*, 'luck', 'fortune', on javelin heads)[1] belongs to Ahiram (later Hiram), who was king of Byblos in the early tenth century; his sarcophagus is expressly said to have been made for him by his son Ittoba'al, and cannot be dated in the thirteenth century B.C.[2] Such an early date is disproved both by the character of the script and by the explicit statement of the text. On the other hand, it is quite true that the representations which cover the sarcophagus carry on the artistic tradition of the thirteenth century in many details, though the execution seems to be much inferior. To the tenth and early ninth centuries belong a number of inscriptions from Byblos written in substantially the same script as that on the Ahiram sarcophagus; all are datable by filiation and epigraphic sequence dating. Since two were inscribed on statues of the Bubastite kings Sheshonq (*c.* 935–914 B.C.) and Osorkon I (*c.* 914–874 B.C.), they may be arranged in the following order:

Ahiram *c.* 1000	Abiba'al (son of Yehimilk?)
Ittoba'al, son of Ahiram	Eliba'al, son of Yehimilk
Yehimilk *c.* 950	Shipitba'al I, son of Eliba'al[3]

Ahiram was on the throne within half a century or so after the reign of Zakarba'al, Wenamun's contemporary.

It is evident from the inscriptions on the statues of Sheshonq and Osorkon that Abiba'al and Eliba'al regarded themselves as vassals of the first two Bubastite pharaohs. Since there is no hint in Sheshonq's own inscriptions of any penetration beyond the plain of Esdraelon, it does not seem probable that he subjugated any part of Phoenicia by military occupation. The most natural explanation of the Byblian data is that Byblos had voluntarily accepted Egyptian suzerainty in order to protect itself from Sidonian encroachment. There is some Greek and Cypriot[4] evidence for limited Byblian competition with the Sidonians in colonizing the eastern Mediterranean, and Menander of Ephesus

[1] See S. Iwry in *J.A.O.S.* 81 (1961), 30 ff.

[2] §III, 20 *passim*. (For specific references see my criticism of this opinion in §II, 4, 2* ff. notes 4 ff.).

[3] For details see §II, 2 and for the list of kings p. 160.

[4] An unpublished study by William R. Lane suggests dialectal peculiarities of probable Byblian origin in certain Phoenician inscriptions from Cyprus.

tells us that Botrys, north of Byblos, was settled by Ittoba'al of Tyre (*c.* 887–856 B.C.)—a statement which presupposes a preceding defeat of Byblos by Tyre.

New evidence proves that the raids of the Sea Peoples on the coast of Palestine and Syria began several decades before the massive invasion in the eighth year of Ramesses III. This in turn supports the date *c.* 1191 B.C. given by Menander of Ephesus, following generally reliable native Tyrian records, for the foundation of Tyre by the Sidonians (after its previous destruction, on which see above).[1] If the Tyrian date is correct, it means that Tyre and Sidon were among the first Syrian seaports to have been destroyed by the Sea Peoples, and that Tyre was rebuilt under Sidonian auspices not long before the final Philistine irruption. By the time of Wenamun, as we have seen, Sidon was still much less important than Byblos, and Tyre is mentioned only in passing. Since Byblos was still inferior in power to the Tjekker, it follows that the dates given from the fourth century B.C. (at least) onward for the foundation of Utica near Carthage (*c.* 1101 B.C.) and of Gades (Cadiz) in Spain (shortly after the Trojan War) are impossible.

But the obvious impossibility of such high dates does not free us from the necessity of examining their basis. Two points must be borne in mind. First, the Phoenicians and Carthaginians reckoned the passage of time, in the absence of fixed written tradition, by generations of forty years, like the Israelites between the thirteenth and the seventh centuries B.C. and like Hecataeus among Greek historians;[2] in earlier times both Israelites and Greeks (Hesiod) had employed a lifetime as chronological unit.[3] Pityusa (Ibiza) was settled by the Carthaginians 160 years, or four generations, after the foundation of Carthage, according to Diodorus; Arganthonius, king of Tartessus in the sixth century B.C., was said to have lived for 120 years, with his life divided into three periods of a generation each, like the life of Moses. From Carthage we have some long genealogical lists; the longest has seventeen generations of a priestly family.[4] This particular list is undoubtedly historical in substance and probably in detail; most

[1] P. 519 and G, 11, 79, n. 2.

[2] On Greek genealogical calculations and their inflationary tendency, see especially §1, 9, and §11, 35.

[3] Well known from Etruria and not so well from Greece (for Hesiod, see §11, 35, 15). For earlier Assyria and Israel see *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 163 (1961), 50 ff.

[4] *Corpus Inscr. Semit.* no. 3778; §11, 26, 305 and Plate 31. Harden dates the stele in the late fourth or early third century B.C., in which case the chronology should extend back to the eighth century soon after the foundation of Carthage.

of the names are otherwise attested and a number of them are hypocoristica. The dedicator's great-great-grandfather bore the good Egyptian name *Pnūfe*, and the earliest ancestor named was called simply *Miṣrī*, 'The Egyptian'. Turning back to the date of the foundation of Utica, which is particularly well attested, we may reckon with an original chronological span calculated on the basis of an exact multiple of forty years, ending at 1101 B.C. Since under the special conditions of colonial adventure we are likely to find some exceptionally long generations, we cannot be far wrong in allowing an average of between twenty-five and thirty years. Being restricted to multiples of forty with a strong probability favouring a whole number of generations, and assuming a starting point between *c.* 600 and 400 B.C., we quickly find that most possibilities cluster about the tenth century B.C. This calculation does not constitute proof, but it fits together with many otherwise known facts to establish a clear pattern.

Thanks to the accumulation of datable epigraphs from different parts of the north-west Semitic world, it is now possible to fix the approximate dates of the earliest known inscriptions from the Phoenician colonies, which include two fairly long texts from Nora in Sardinia and from Cyprus,[1] as well as two small fragments from Nora and Bosa in Sardinia. Both script and language are good Phoenician of ninth-century type; attempts to assign them dates below the early eighth century at latest are quite impossible. The contention that the Nora text was not a complete funerary text but part of a decree which must have covered the face of several stones[2] was rejected by many scholars, but was confirmed and further developed by B. Mazar during a visit to Sardinia in 1962,[3] and he has also shown that the text originally extended farther to the right as well as to the left than had been proposed. The now certain date of the inscriptions in question proves that the beginning of Phoenician colonization in Cyprus and Sardinia cannot well be placed later than the tenth century and that a date after the ninth century is impossible.

A striking confirmation of the early date of the painted pottery in the lowest level of the Tanit Precinct at Carthage, has been obtained by comparison of the published material with similar

[1] §II, 1; and A. M. Honeyman in *Iraq*, 6 (1939), 106 ff.

[2] That it is part of a decree is made probable by the words of the text as well as the relatively huge size of the characters, which would be singularly inappropriate for a funerary stele. In the Mediterranean world we are accustomed to the laws of Gortyn in Crete, dating in their present form from the fifth century B.C. Parallels elsewhere are too numerous to mention.

[3] See provisionally §I, 27, 17 ff., and the excellent photograph published as Fig. 9.

painted ware from Megiddo (which was at the time wholly in the orbit of Sidonian material culture).[1] The Megiddo ware in question is almost all attributed to Stratum V by the excavators, but it is not clear whether this refers to VB (early tenth century) or to VA+ IVB (a single stratum of Solomonic date from the second half of the tenth century).[2] If the ware continued into IVA it is even possible that the latest pieces (no longer characteristic) may date well down into the ninth century. We must, of course, assume that this ware was brought to North Africa not later than the late tenth or the early ninth century B.C., and that it continued to be manufactured until the eighth century, some time after it had disappeared in Phoenicia. Such phenomena are exceedingly common.

Art-historical data are also accumulating steadily, even though rather slowly. The finds at Aliseda near Cáceres in western Spain, about half-way up the Portuguese border, carry us back definitely to the seventh and eighth centuries B.C.[3] Much more important are the ivories from Carmona in the Guadalquivir valley near Seville, which have long been known,[4] but are now being dated much too late, after years in which they were accidentally dated correctly—at least in principle. These ivories do not resemble any late ivories from the eastern Mediterranean, but are intermediate in type between the Megiddo ivories (dated by Egyptian inscriptions and stratigraphy between *c.* 1300 and 1150 B.C.) and the Syro-Phoenician ivories of the ninth and eighth centuries, now known so well from different sites.[5] This intermediate date is particularly obvious when one compares the combs from Megiddo and Carmona, and then compares the Carmona combs with imported pieces from the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia in Sparta, dating roughly between 750 and 650 B.C.[6] The Carmona plaque D 513 has a griffin of Mycenaean type[7] and a warrior with spiked helmet, spear and shield like the well-known figures on the back of the warrior vase of Mycenae (about the end of the thirteenth century B.C.).[8] The coat of mail is Asiatic and the drawing of the head in profile is characteristically Egyptian in style. The last piece suggests a Cypriot prototype. That the Carmona ivories are not of local manufacture is shown by the discovery at Carthage of an ivory comb in precisely the same style, but with the addition of a bull and a female sphinx. In the writer's opinion there is only

[1] See provisionally §I, 5, 175 and note.
[2] §I, 5, 175; §II, 4, 5*; §II, 5, 346 ff.
[3] See especially A. Freijeiro in *Archivo Español de Arqueología*, 30 (1956), 3 ff.
[4] §II, 9. [5] §II, 6; §II, 7; §II, 34, etc. [6] §II, 16, 222 ff. and Plates CXXIX ff.
[7] The late A. J. B. Wace first called my attention to this. [8] §I, 8, fig. 265.

one reasonable conclusion, that they were made for export in quantity and that they belong to the very beginning of Phoenician trade with Spain in the tenth and ninth centuries B.C. If this is the case it would explain the complete absence of comparable material in western sites known to belong to about the seventh century B.C., as well as the apparent fact that no other foreign imports are known to have been recovered from the Iberian tumuli near Carmona where the ivories were found.

If we relate the evidence described in the preceding paragraphs to Sidonian history, it becomes obvious that it was quite impossible for Sidon and Tyre to expand their sea-trade in the Mediterranean until after the elimination of the Philistine sea and land 'empire' which lasted from the conquest of Palestine *c.* 1050 B.C. until the destruction of Philistine power by David during the first quarter of the tenth century B.C. (probably about 975). Our information about the succession of Sidonian kings of Tyre begins with Hiram's father Abiba'al at the beginning of the tenth century. It was probably Abiba'al who established Phoenician power in Cyprus,[1] and his son Hiram I (*c.* 969–936 B.C.), who was closely allied with both David and Solomon, may have continued the search for copper by initiating the serious exploitation of the mineral wealth of Sardinia. Utica also, near Carthage, was probably founded about this time. Before the end of the tenth century the Phoenicians had probably founded Gades, which bears the good Phoenician name *Ha-gader*, 'the walled enclosure'. Whether the Phoenicians or the native Iberians organized the trading caravans which travelled up the Guadalquivir valley past Seville and Carmona, branched off northward toward Cáceres and continued on into north-western Spain we shall not know until there have been systematic excavations along the route taken by these caravans.[2]

The Hebrew designation 'Tarshish ships' for the sea-faring vessels of Hiram's navy probably refers to ore-carrying ships, or perhaps to ships which were sufficiently large and strong to carry loads of copper ingots, like the thirteenth-century ship recently excavated off the southern coast of Anatolia.[3] Such refinery ships seem to have been called *kry* in Ugaritic and Egyptian (plural).[4] There is no direct reference to voyages to Tarshish (originally

[1] §II, 5, 348 and 361; §I, 27, 15.

[2] This route was first proposed by B. Mazar in 1957; see §II, 5, 347.

[3] §II, 8, 2 ff.

[4] These words are presumably derived from common Semitic *kūr*, 'smelting furnace'. Ugaritic *wry* should be read *kry*. The Eg. sing. is both *kr* and *ḳr*.

Tharros in Sardinia?)[1] in the narratives about Solomon's reign, but the expeditions sent out jointly by Hiram and Solomon, following the old trade association tradition, into the Indian Ocean certainly required just as large and strong vessels. There is no reason to locate Ophir anywhere except in the region extending from Eritrea to Somalia and possibly beyond it. In this region (Egyptian Punt) were to be obtained the gold, silver, ivory, ebony and two kinds of monkeys which are listed as the principal imports.[2] Excavations at Tell el-Kheleifeh near 'Aqaba make it virtually certain that this is the Ezion-geber which was the expedition's base of operations.[3]

The tenth century was, in any case, the golden age of Phoenician wealth and power, before the entire hinterland was overrun by the armies of the Aramaeans and the Assyrians. Little as we know directly about Phoenicia at that time, our indirect evidence is considerable; we have sketched only certain aspects of it.

III. THE SYRO-HITTITE STATES

After the Hittite Empire had been destroyed by the barbarian hordes from the north-west, towards the end of the thirteenth century B.C., the Phrygians and other Indo-European peoples occupied the central plateau of Anatolia. In the mountainous south-eastern provinces (later Cataonia, Melitene and Commagene), the native population seems to have resisted so strongly that it was allowed to go its own way. Syria was protected by the Taurus range and the tough fibre of the northern mountaineers. The Hittites had established several vassal states in northern Syria during the initial period of their occupation in the fourteenth century B.C. At least two of them, Carchemish and Aleppo, were ruled by princes of the imperial Hittite dynasty. In a third state, Khattina, the reigning princes still bore names derived from imperial Hittite history as late as the ninth century B.C., and the imperial name Mutallu was borne by two kings of Gurgum and one of Commagene who are mentioned in the Assyrian records. In the century immediately following the collapse of the Hittite Empire there seems to have been some tendency to bring the various Hittite states together. The inscriptions of Tiglath-

[1] §II, 15, 280 ff.; §II, 5, 361, n. 103.

[2] Both the *qōpīm* and the TKYM (1 Kings x. 22) bear Egyptian names; cf. T. O. Lambdin, in *J.A.O.S.* 73 (1953), 154, and W. F. Albright in G, 9, II, 252*a*, s.v., 'Fauna: Primates'.

[3] §II, 25, 89 ff.

pileser I (1115–1077) repeatedly mention 'great Khatti', whose king, Ini-Teshub,[1] was defeated by the Assyrians. Since this name was borne by a king of Carchemish in the thirteenth century, he probably ruled there also, but Melid (modern Malatya) is said to belong to 'the great land of Khatti' under a local prince with a Hittite imperial name.[2]

Through surface finds and excavations in Syria many Hittite reliefs and hieroglyphic inscriptions have come to light. The first such finds were made at Hamath in 1871; in 1879 A. H. Sayce pointed out that the script on these monuments was identical with the writing on several Anatolian monuments and correctly applied the term 'Hittite' to them. Early Hittite monuments have since been found by the Germans at Zincirli, by the British at Carchemish, and by the French at Malatya on the border of Syria and Anatolia; later sculptures have also been found at many other sites.[3] Thanks to careful stylistic analysis of the pictured reliefs, it is possible to divide them roughly into three groups: (1) monuments showing clear affinities with the art of the great Hittite Empire (fourteenth and thirteenth centuries); (2) transitional monuments showing less true Hittite and Hurrian tradition and more affected by contemporary Phoenician and Aramaean art; (3) monuments influenced directly by Assyrian art.[4] This sequence has been best preserved at Malatya, where the monuments of the Lion Gate may safely be dated to the eleventh century and may in part be still earlier.[5] At Carchemish a much fuller chronological series has been admirably demonstrated.[6]

In 1930 Piero Meriggi published the important discovery that certain groups of characters in the Hittite hieroglyphic monuments represented words for 'son' and 'grandson'. The successful decipherment of the script of these monuments began almost immediately after this discovery and has since been carried to a point where most of the syllabic signs can be read.[7] By combining study of the order of royal names with stylistic analysis of the inscribed monuments, system has been brought out of chaos. Of course, there are dangers: little is yet known about palaeography; the same name may be repeated several times in the course of several

[1] Formerly read *Ili-Teshub*, but the name is identical with the thirteenth-century *Ini-Teshub*, transcribed into Egyptian as well as into cuneiform; cf. §III, 2, 154.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] See especially §III, 7; 11.

[4] §III, 2 with the bibliographic indications in the footnotes.

[5] §III, 1; 2, 153 ff.

[6] §III, 44, *passim*. See also §III, 2, 155 ff.

[7] §III, 28; 35.

centuries; uninscribed monuments may be wrongly attributed. The union of the two methods brings assured results only in the case of monuments which are stylistically of the latest Assyrianizing type and bear royal names attested by Assyrian inscriptions: e.g. Warpalawas (Assyrian Urpalla) of Tyana. Thanks to figured monuments with Aramaic or Canaanite inscriptions, we know that the critical phase of the shift from pre-Assyrian to Assyrianizing art came in northern Syria west of the Euphrates between *c.* 850 and 825 B.C.[1] If we date the transitional group of monuments between the middle decades of the tenth and the third quarter of the ninth century we can scarcely be far wrong; the archaic group best illustrated by the Lion Gate at Malatya will fall between the late twelfth century and the middle of the tenth.

At Carchemish, thanks to the careful analysis of Barnett, it is possible to distinguish between the sculptures of the Water Gate, which are badly damaged but seem to be roughly contemporary with the Sulumeli reliefs of the Lion Gate at Malatya, and the reliefs of the Sukhis Dynasty in the late tenth or early ninth century B.C.[2] The sculptures of the Water Gate at Carchemish belong to the same general age as the inscriptions of the kings whose names were read provisionally as 'Pa-ī-da' and his son 'GREAT-pa';[3] both are called 'king of Carchemish', 'great king', and may go back to the time of Tiglath-pileser I of Assyria or a little later.[4] The following Sukhis dynasty closed with a king named Katuwas, not long before the time of Sankaras (Sangara of the Assyrian monuments, attested before 866 and until 848 B.C.).

Since it is now possible to analyse the increasing influence of neo-Assyrian art on the West, as the Assyrian arms advanced westward, a few observations on areas just outside of Syria proper will help to illuminate the situation in Syria itself. In the first place neo-Assyrian influence had not yet affected known specimens of Aramaean art in the Euphrates valley in 886 (the stele of Tell 'Asharah south of the confluence of the Euphrates and Khabur) and *c.* 875 (the slightly later steles of Tell Aḥmar, south of Carchemish).[5] Similarly, it appears certain that the reliefs of Tell Halaf (Gozan), from the time of Kapara, precede the Assyrian occupation of the district in 894 B.C., since none of them show any neo-Assyrian influence whatever.[6] A date about the second

[1] §III, 2, *passim*.

[2] §III, 2, 157 (after R. D. Barnett in §III, 44, 260 ff.). See above p. 441.

[3] These names are now read *x-pa-zitis* and GREAT THUNDER (=Ura-Tarhundas). See J. D. Hawkins in *Iraq* 36 (1974), p. 71. (Ed.)

[4] §III, 44, 259. [5] §III, 2, 147 ff. and 156 ff. [6] §III, 2, 150 ff.; §III, 3.

half of the tenth century for most of the reliefs of Gozan is, therefore, clear. Turning to eastern Cilicia, just outside Syria on the north-west, there is absolutely no sign of neo-Assyrian influence on the sculptures of Karatepe, which must, accordingly, date from the ninth century, as it has been observed.[1] They cannot reasonably be dated in the eighth century—much less in the seventh (as recently attempted by a few classical archaeologists, accustomed to reducing Iron Age chronology as much as possible). It is true that the Phoenician script of the bilingual texts has been dated in the third quarter of the eighth century, but examination of the photographs shows that several late forms of letters do not actually occur on the original; a date about 800 B.C. is highly probable. A substantial lag between the neo-Assyrian style of Kilamuwa in neighbouring Sam'al (Zincirli) and the nearly contemporaneous sculptures of Karatepe may be explained geographically. A date for the sculptures of Karatepe earlier in the ninth century remains, however, possible. The recurrence of the royal name *'Wrk* (*Urikki*) in both the ninth and the eighth centuries offers no problem.

In the present state of our evidence, it seems clear that the refusal of an earlier authority to recognize the existence of any monumental art or architecture in the neo-Hittite states of northern Syria between 1200 and 850 B.C. was entirely wrong.[2] In fact it is now becoming increasingly clear that the eleventh and tenth centuries were the golden age of Syro-Hittite art and architecture. By the end of the tenth century most of the small states of northern Syria had become Aramaized, even though some of them continued to give their kings royal names of imperial Hittite or Luwian (in Sham'al and Gurgum) or mixed character.

IV. EMERGENCE OF THE ARAMAEANS

Aramaean origins are elusive, in spite of the fact that we have much scattered information about early Aramaean political history; the less said about supposed occurrences of the name *Aram* in cuneiform texts of the late third and early second millennium the better. And yet within four centuries of the time when they are first mentioned as a people in contemporary inscriptions, Aramaic had become the *lingua franca* of south-western Asia. We are, however, faced with serious difficulties in trying to locate the region where the Aramaic language—and presumably its original speakers—became differentiated from a common Semitic background. We

[1] From oral information given the writer by Dr R. D. Barnett in October 1964.
[2] §III, 20, 164 ff., and against it §III, 2, and §II, 4.

first meet with Aramaeans in the Syrian Desert in the reign of Tiglath-pileser I (1115–1077); they were then called by the Assyrians 'Aramaean bedawin' (*Aḫlamē Armāya*). The earliest inscriptions containing more than a word or two belong to Bar-hadad and Hazael of Damascus; the former dates from about 850 and the latter from somewhere between *c.* 840 and 800. Both are in standard Old Aramaic, and so are the Zakir inscriptions from Hamath (before *c.* 750 B.C.) and the Sefire treaties from the neighbourhood of Aleppo (*c.* 750 B.C.). On the other hand, the two long eighth-century inscriptions of Panammu from Zincirli (Sam'al) are composed in an Aramaic dialect with Canaanite affinities, which has been termed 'Yaudic'.[1] Panammu's son wrote his own inscriptions in standard Aramaic. In the light of this situation it seems to be reasonably certain that standard Aramaic was originally the language of the kingdom of Damascus, called simply 'Aram' in native inscriptions and Old Testament literature.

Analysis of the relation between Aramaic and the older north-west-Semitic language of the second millennium shows clearly that the former is not a derivative of South Canaanite (Phoenician) or of North Canaanite (Ugaritic) or Amorite, though it has more in common with the two latter than with the former. In sibilant shift it differs from the other three; in the use of *n* dual and plural it agrees with Amorite. In verbal structure it is rather more closely related to Amorite than to the other two. Early Aramaic was strongly influenced by Phoenician in vocabulary and morphology; from the seventh century onwards Assyro-Babylonian influence dominated, as we can easily see from its sentence structure, as well as from hundreds of loan-words. The superficial difference in sound between Aramaic and Hebrew is largely due to the fact that the forward shift of the accent, common to all known north-west-Semitic tongues after the thirteenth century B.C., reached its climax in Aramaic and was extended to include the article (*h*)*a*, which was attached to the end of the noun (just as in Romanian among the Romance languages). In brief, examination of the linguistic situation confirms our first impression that Aramaic developed somewhere in eastern Syria, possibly growing out of Sutu dialects spoken there in the Late Bronze Age.[2]

[1] G, 6, 153 ff.

[2] Aramaic is not a direct offshoot of 'Amorite', as sometimes thought, but is rather intermediate in type between it and the proto-Arabic dialects of north Arabia. The relation must, however, have been complex, and later Aramaic was strongly influenced by Phoenician (south Canaanite) and by Assyro-Babylonian (Akkadian).

If we turn to Hebrew and Israelite tradition, we gain some idea of the complex tribal relation which presumably existed. The Aramaean stock must have been so mixed that tradition became hopelessly divergent. In Gen. x. 22–3, Aram is one of the principal Semitic peoples, along with Elam, Ashur, and Arphaxad (the putative non-Semitic ancestor of the Hebrews); its principal subdivisions are listed as Uz, Hul, Gether and Mash.[1] Since the nucleus of the list in Genesis X probably goes back to the tenth century B.C.,[2] these names ought to be very instructive; unhappily only Uz and Mash are otherwise known. In a somewhat later(?) passage, Gen. xxii. 20–4, Aram appears as the offshoot of Kemuel, one of the eight sons of Abraham's brother Nahor. Nahor is now known to have been the eponym of the town by that name, probably east of Harran; Nahor (*Naḫur*) appears frequently in Bronze Age documents from Mari and elsewhere, and is mentioned explicitly as a town in Gen. xxiv. 10. Unfortunately, again, most of the eight names are otherwise unknown: Uz reappears elsewhere in the Bible; Chesed is the eponym of the Chaldaeans; Hazo and Buz are Assyrian Khazu and Bazu, in central or eastern Arabia; Bethuel is the traditional father of Rebecca. Nahor's secondary wife, Reumah, is credited with being the mother of Tebah (Tubikhu of Zobah, in central Syria), Tahash (Takhshu, a district north of the region of Damascus), Gaham and Maachah (west of the region of Damascus). The name of Aram's father Kemuel is archaic in formation,[3] but is otherwise unknown. If we add to these two divergent traditions the fact that in the Patriarchal narratives the family of Abraham is represented as closely related to the Aramaeans of the Harran district, and that the Deuteronomic source speaks of Abraham as a 'wandering Aramaean' (Deut. xxvi. 5),[4] the problem becomes still more intricate. Finally, Amos ix. 7 says that the Aramaeans came from some land called Kir, just as the Israelites came from Egypt and the Philistines from Caphtor;[5] Kir is elsewhere stated to be a region near Elam to which the Aramaeans were exiled!

[1] §III, 4, 2 ff.

[2] Most of Gen. x has been attributed by documentary critics to J, which is now increasingly recognized as the chief source of E and partly of P (Noth, Mowinckel, etc.), and is dated by more and more scholars (e.g. the Baltimore school) in the tenth century.

[3] *Probably revocalized in Hebrew tradition and actually derived from an original* *[*Yaq*]*qim-el* ('May El Be His Champion').

[4] Since '*RMY* meant 'travelling trader' in early South Arabic (Qatabanian), the phrase may possibly have meant 'wandering trader'; cf. G, 7, 34 ff., and *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 163 (1961), 44 ff. and 164, 28.

[5] See above, p. 512.

From the preceding survey of the evidence it is clear that we have to do with a complex process, which may be provisionally sketched as follows. The original speakers of Aramaic were nomads of mixed origin, who began settling down on the fringes of the Syrian Desert in the third quarter of the second millennium. They may then have headed a confederation of tribes which took advantage of the collapse of the Hittite and Egyptian empires, followed by the break-up of the Assyrian empire of Tukulti-Ninurta I, to invade *en masse* already tilled lands. The tribesmen pushed westward into Syria and eastward into the valleys of the Euphrates and its tributaries. Settling wherever possible in the fertile river valleys, they combined sheep-herding with agriculture and probably with caravan trade, after the introduction of camels had given them an extraordinary advantage over donkey caravaneers.[1] Their prestige was such that other nomad tribes joined them from southern Babylonia to the Upper Euphrates, and Aramaic rapidly displaced related dialects, at first for tribal intercommunication and eventually for all purposes. The descendants of the Amorites became Aramaean, a process doubtless facilitated by close dialectal similarities. This process was still at work in Babylonia in the eighth century B.C.; it has been shown that the nomad 'Aramaean' tribes of Babylonia at that time were mostly Arabs who had become assimilated to the Aramaeans.[2]

The original name of the Aramaeans was *Aram* (with two short *a* vowels and the accent on the first syllable), as may be shown by comparing the derived forms in different Semitic languages. The early Assyrian shift between nominative *Arumu*, genitive *Arimi*, and gentilic *Armāyu* resulted from the operation of Assyrian dialectal vowel harmony; it has nothing to do with the original pronunciation of the name. We cannot tell whether the name was at first personal or geographical; the suggestion, sometimes made, that it already appears in Old Akkadian or other early Babylonian texts is improbable.

As already noted, we first meet the Aramaeans in the contemporary documents of Tiglath-pileser I (1115–1077 B.C.). In his fourth year (1112) he launched a simultaneous attack on Aramaean settlements in different parts of the Euphrates valley, from the land of Shuah (Assyrian Sukhu), north-west of Babylonia, as far as Carchemish. Crossing the Euphrates in pursuit of the Aramaeans he burned six 'towns' at the foot of Mount Bishrī (*Bišrī*), that is, in Palmyrēnē. In a later, undated inscription the

[1] For recent bibliography see *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 163 (1962), 38, n. 9.

[2] §III, 37.

king claims to have crossed the Euphrates for the twenty-eighth time (twice in one year) in order to pursue the Aramaean bedawin. Here he specifies that the Aramaeans were routed from Tadmor (Palmyra) itself to Anath ('Ānah) in Shuah and even to Rapiqu on the Babylonian frontier. The struggle with the Aramaeans continued under the following kings. If the attribution of a fragmentary unpublished text to Ashur-bēl-kala is correct,[1] that king fought against Aram (*mat Arime*) in 1070. About 1062 Adad-apla-iddina, a usurper who is said by a cuneiform chronicle to have been an Aramaean, gained the throne of Babylonia. Contemporary records now come to an almost complete end in Mesopotamia, but later Assyrian inscriptions give us valuable data. Thus Ashur-dan II (934–912) informs us that the Aramaeans had occupied part of the region between the Lesser Zab and the Ḥamrīn mountains, in the East-Tigris country between Assyria and Babylonia, during the reign of Ashur-rabi II (1013–973 B.C.). Under the same king, according to an inscription of Shalmaneser III (858–824 B.C.), an Aramaean king had stormed the Assyrian stronghold of Mutkinu on the Upper Euphrates, opposite the Hittite town of Pitru (Pethor). Mutkinu had been in Assyrian hands since the time of Tiglath-pileser I, according to this same inscription; its loss evidently made a great impression on the Assyrians. Since Ashur-rabi II was an older contemporary of David, we may safely connect the Aramaean triumph with the situation presupposed in 2 Sam. vii. 3 and x. 16. According to this early source, Hadadezer, king of the Aramaeans of Zobah, was fighting at the Euphrates when David attacked him from the south, between 990 and 980 B.C. It seems only natural to suppose that the Assyrians had a share in turning David's attention to the Aramaeans, since the former were fighting for their lifeline to Syria and might reasonably be expected to look for allies wherever they were available.[2]

The Israelites seem to have first come into hostile contact with the Aramaeans towards the end of the eleventh century in the reign of Saul, who is said to have fought with 'the kings of Zobah' (1 Sam. xiv. 47). When we hear next of Zobah in the reign of David it was ruled by Hadadezer of Beth-rehob,[3] who controlled all eastern Syria from southern Ḥaurān to the Euphrates. Zobah appears as *Ṣubatu* (*Ṣubutu*, *Ṣubiti*) in Assyrian documents of the

[1] §III, 43, 84 f.

[2] §III, 15, 25 ff.; §III, 42, 42 ff.; §III, 31, 82 ff.; §III, 32, 102 ff.

[3] Beth-rehob (inferred from *ben Reḥōb*) was probably not Riḥāb north of Jerash, as thought by H. Guthe, but an unknown place of the same name in eastern Syria.

eighth and seventh centuries; it was then a province of greater Damascus, located in eastern Syria. From the account of David's war against Zobah we learn that the chief cities of Hadadezer at that time were Tebah (Late Bronze Tubikhu), Chun (Late Bronze Kunu, Roman Conna) and Berothai (perhaps Bereitan south of Ba'albek).[1] Though all three towns are in the Biqā', between Lebanon and Antilebanon, there can be no reasonable doubt that the land of Zobah proper lay east and north of Antilebanon, and was roughly equivalent to Bronze-Age Takhshu (Tahash, Gen. xxii. 24). Hadadezer was evidently the most important Aramaean ruler of his day; it may well have been he who stormed the Assyrian fortress of Mutkinu on the Upper Euphrates;[2] 2 Sam. viii. 10 (1 Chron. xviii. 10) states that he and Toi (Tou), king of Hamath, had been at war with one another. According to one account of David's war with Hadadezer, the latter began hostilities by sending aid to the Ammonites, who had provoked David into attacking them. In the course of the resulting war, the Aramaean confederation was roundly defeated; we hear of the Aramaeans of Beth-rehob, Geshur (later Gaulanitis, north of Gilead), Maachah (the district around Hermon, west and south-west of Damascus), Ish-tob[3] and Damascus, as well as of auxiliary forces from beyond the Euphrates. The two accounts in 2 Sam. viii and x are too fragmentary to enable us to reconstruct the course of events in detail. The outcome was decisive; Israelite garrisons were placed in Hadadezer's territory, especially in Damascus, and great booty was seized, including gold, silver and especially copper. Thenceforward, until the death of Solomon, the further rise of the Aramaeans in Syria was effectually checked; but the growth of their power in Mesopotamia became correspondingly accelerated.

During the period of obscurity which settled over Assyria under the two weak kings who succeeded Ashur-rabi II, the Aramaeans gained ground very rapidly. By the reign of the *roi fainéant* Tiglath-pileser II (967–935 B.C.) they had occupied Gidara in the region of Nisibis, half-way from the upper Khabur River to the frontiers of Assyria itself. To the second half of the tenth century belong the palace and reliefs of the Aramaean king Kapara[4] at Guzana (Tell Halaf, Gozan in 2 Kings xvii. 6) at the source of the Khabur river. Kapara calls himself 'son of Khadianu,' the Aramaic form of the name which appears as Hezion in

[1] In no case Berytus!

[2] See preceding page.

[3] Still enigmatic, though a plausible suggestion connects it with Golan = Gaulanitis east of the Sea of Galilee.

[4] See above, p. 528.

1 Kings xv. 18; the men (or clans) by the name were in any case contemporary. The Aramaean tribe which occupied the territory of Gozan was called Bakhianu (Aramaic *Baḥyān*); its chief was Abisalamu (Absalom) at the beginning of the ninth century.[1]

An inscription of Ashur-dan II (934–912), with whom the Assyrian revival began, mentions the Aramaeans in connexion with campaigns in the west and south-east of Assyria, but it is difficult to form a clear picture. Under his son Adad-nīrāri II (911–891) we have a well-preserved account of the operations against the Aramaeans which occupied much of the king's reign. It is significant, however, that there is no mention of a campaign against the Aramaeans of northern Mesopotamia until about his eleventh year. From then until the end of his reign the Assyrians directed campaign after campaign against the Aramaeans, mentioning particularly various chiefs of the large tribe of Teman[2] which had occupied the region of Nisibis. The military culmination of his reign was reached in 892, when Gozan was captured and the settlements of the Khabur Valley capitulated, one after another. In 877 we have the first mention of the Aramaean state of Bīt-Adini (Biblical Beth-eden), which occupied both banks of the Upper Euphrates below Carchemish.

Meanwhile Solomon had died and Damascus had made good its independence, under an otherwise unknown Aramaean chieftain named Rezon. The latter can scarcely have remained in power long, since early in the ninth century we find Ben-hadad I on the throne; Ben-hadad is said to have been son of a Tabrimmon and grandson of a Hezion, that is, perhaps, member of the clan of Hezion (Khadianu in cuneiform).[3] The new state took over the domination of the northern part of the Syrian desert as political heir of Hadadezer of Zobah; in an inscription from the latter part of Ben-hadad's reign, about 850 B.C., the latter calls himself 'king of Aram', in accord with the practice frequently attested in the Bible and also found in the inscription of Zakir, king of Hamath. It is probably not accidental that the king's personal name was also Hadadezer, like that of his predecessor on the throne of Zobah a century earlier. We may perhaps compare the title 'king of Aram', borne by the princes of Damascus, with

[1] §III, 3, 82.

[2] Probably not derived from north Arabic *Teimā* (Babylonian *Tema*, biblical and Qumrān *Tēmān*). The name means simply 'southerner'.

[3] The writer's decipherment of the same names in the Ben-hadad inscription from near Aleppo (in *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 87 (1942), 27 ff.) is disputed, but nothing cogent has been proposed in their place.

the title 'king of all the Arabs', borne by 'Amru 'l-Qais in the inscription of an-Namarah (A.D. 328).

The climax of Aramaean political domination in Mesopotamia may thus be dated between about 950 and 900 B.C.; its climax in Syria did not come until the ninth century, owing partly to the lag caused by the triumph of David over Hadadezer. The remarkable accumulation of wealth in the hands of these Aramaean chieftains, attested in both Hebrew and Assyrian records, was undoubtedly in large part the result of commercial activity. We have already noted that the Aramaeans introduced the use of camels in the caravan trade of Syria and northern Mesopotamia. In keeping with the new importance of the camel, we find representations of riding camels in the late tenth century at both Gozan and Carchemish; references to camels became common in Assyrian inscriptions of the ninth century.

The art of the Aramaeans in the tenth century was still almost purely Syro-Hittite, as we know from the older monuments of Zincirli, Hamath and Gozan. It would be a mistake to assume that the bearers of this Syro-Hittite art were still prevailingly non-Semitic. An excellent illustration is the Melcarth stele of Ben-hadad I, found near Aleppo;[1] though dating from about the middle of the ninth century and inscribed in pure Aramaic, the figure of the god which adorns it does not yet show any clear influence from Assyrian or contemporary Phoenician art; it is still Syro-Hittite. At Hamath we know that Hittite inscriptions continued to be carved under Urkhilina (Irkhulina) as late as the middle of the ninth century, but a century earlier Hadoram, son of Tou, had borne a characteristically Semitic name. We have already noted above that the Aramaeans were actually the dominant people in Sham'al, Gurgum and other old Hittite states at least from the ninth century on and probably still earlier. It was not long before the enterprise of the Aramaeans freed them completely from the dead hand of the Hittite past. This does not mean, however, that the Hittites simply disappeared from this region. There is, in fact, very strong reason to derive the Armenians[2] (who occupied the whole country from Cilicia through Armenia Major until the times of the Arab, Kurdish, and Turkish irruptions) both physically and linguistically from the Hittites.

[1] See preceding note.   [2] §III, 5.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABBREVIATIONS

Abh. Berlin (*München etc.*). *Abhandlungen der Preussischen* (*Bayerischen etc.*) *Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse*

Abh. D.O.G. *Abhandlungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*

A.Bo.T. *Ankara Arkeoloji Müzesinde bulunan Boğazköy Tabletleri*

Acta Arch. *Acta Archaeologica*

Acta Or. *Acta Orientalia*

Ägyptol. Abh. *Ägyptologische Abhandlung*

Ägyptol. Forsch. *Ägyptologische Forschungen*

A.I.A.R.S. *Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae*

A.I.R.R.S. *Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae*

A.J. *Antiquaries Journal*

A.J.A. *American Journal of Archaeology*

A.J.Ph. *American Journal of Philology*

A.J.S.L. *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*

Alte Or. *Der Alte Orient*

Altor. Forsch. *Altorientalische Forschungen*

A.M. *Annales du Midi*

A.M.I. *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran*

An. Or. *Analecta Orientalia*

A.N.E.T. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament*

Ann. Arch. Anthr. *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* (Liverpool)

Ann. Arch. de Syrie. *Annales Archéologiques de Syrie*

Ann. A.S.O.R. *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*

Ann. Inst. philol. hist. or. (*et slaves*). *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales* (*et slaves*)

Ann. Mus. Guimet. *Annales du Musée Guimet*

Ann. Serv. *Annales du Service des Antiquités de l'Égypte*

Ann. Univ. Ferrara. *Annali della Università di Ferrara*

Antiq. *Antiquity*

A.O.B. *Altorientalische Bibliothek*

A.O.S. *American Oriental Series/Society*

Arch. Anz. *Archaeologischer Anzeiger*. Beiblatt zum *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts*

Arch. de l'Institut de Pal. hum. *Archives de l'Institut de Paléontologie humaine*

Arch. Delt. Ἀρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον

Arch. Eph. (Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.). Ἀρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς

Arch. f. Keil. *Archiv für Keilschriftforschung*

Arch. f. Or. *Archiv für Orientforschung*

Arch. f. Rel. *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*

Arch. Orient. *Archiv Orientální*

Arh. Radovi i Rasprave. *Arheologiski radovi i rasprave*

Arkæol. Kunsthist. Medd. Dan. Vid. Selsk. *Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Arkæologisk-kunsthistoriske Meddelelser*

A.R.M.T. *Archives royales de Mari* (translation vols.)

A.S.A.A. *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle Missioni italiane in Oriente*
A. St. *Anatolian Studies*
Ath. Mitt. *Athenische Mitteilungen, Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*
Atti Accad. Lincei. *Atti della Accademia nazionale dei Lincei*
Austr. Bibl. Rev. *Australian Biblical Review*
B.A. *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*
B.C.H. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*
B.E. *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*
Beitr. z. Hist. Theol. *Beiträge zur historischen Theologie*
Beitr. zur Wiss. vom A. (*u. N.*) *T.* *Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten* (*und Neuen*) *Testament*
Bi. Ar. *Biblical Archaeologist*
Bib. *Biblica*
Bibl. Aeg. *Bibliotheca Aegyptiaca*
Bibl. arch. et hist. *Bibliothèque archéologique et historique*
B.I.C.S. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London*
Bi. Or. *Bibliotheca Orientalis*
Bol. de la Soc. Esp. de Excursiones. *Boletín de la Sociedad Española de Excursiones*
Boll. d'Arte. *Bollettino d'Arte*
Boll. della Soc. Geog. Ital. *Bollettino della Società Geografica Italiana*
Boll. di Paletn. Ital. *Bollettino di Paletnologia Italiana*
Bo. Stu. *Boghazköi-Studien*
Brooklyn Mus. Annual *Brooklyn Museum Annual*
B.S.A. *Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens*
Bull. Amer. Inst. for Persian Art and Arch. *Bulletin of the American Institute for Persian Art and Archaeology*
Bull. A.S.O.R. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
Bull. Hist. Med. *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*
Bull. Inst. Archaeol. London. *Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology, University of London*
Bull. Inst. d'Ég. *Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte*
Bull. M.M.A. *Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York)
Bull. Ryl. Libr. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* (Manchester)
Bull. S.A.J. *British School of Archaeology in Jerusalem. Bulletin*
Bull. S.O.A.S. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*
Bull. Soc. fr. Égyptol. *Bulletin de la Société française d'Égyptologie*
Bull. Soc. Ling. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris*
Bull. Soc. préh. fr. *Bulletin de la Société préhistorique française*
Bull. Univ. Mus. Penna. *Bulletin of the University Museum, University of Pennsylvania*
C.A.H. *Cambridge Ancient History*
Cah. Ar. B. *Cahiers d'archéologie biblique*
Cah. H.M. *Cahiers d'histoire mondiale* (cf. *J.W.H.*)
Cath. Bibl. Quart. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
C.C.G. *Cairo Museum, Catalogue général des antiquités égyptiennes*
Chron. d'Ég. *Chronique d'Égypte*
Cl. Phil. *Classical Philology*
Cl. Quart. *Classical Quarterly*
Cl. Rev. *Classical Review*

C.-R. Ac. Inscr. B.-L. *Comptes-Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*
Denk. k. Akad. Wiss. Wien. *Denkschriften des kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*
D.L.Z. *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*
Eph. Arch. Ἐφημερὶς Ἀρχαιολογική
E.E.S. *Egypt Exploration Society*
Flles Inst. fr. Caire. *Fouilles de l'Institut français du Caire*
Forsch. Rel. Lit. *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*
Forsch. u. Fortschr. *Forschungen und Fortschritte*
G.J. *Geographical Journal*
G.R.B.S. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies, Duke University, Durham, N.C.*
Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
H.U.C.A. *Hebrew Union College Annual*
I.E.J. *Israel Exploration Journal*
Ill. Ldn News. *Illustrated London News*
Indogerm. Forsch. *Indogermanische Forschungen*
Ist. Mitt. *Istanbuler Mitteilungen, Deutsches archäologisches Institut, Abteilung Istanbul*
J.A. *Journal asiatique*
Jahrb. f. Cl. Ph. *Jahrbuch für classische Philologie*
J.A.O.S. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*
J.A.R.C.E. *Journal of the American Research Center in Egypt*
J. Bibl. Lit. *Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*
J.C.S. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
J.D.A.I. *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts*
J.E.A. *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
J.E.O.L. *Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap, 'Ex Oriente Lux'*
J.E.S.H.O. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*
J.H.S. *Journal of Hellenic Studies*
J.K.F. *Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung*
J.K.P.K. *Jahrbuch der königlich-preussischen Kunstammlungen*
J.N.E.S. *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
J.P.O.S. *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*
J.R.A.S. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*
J.S.S. *Journal of Semitic Studies*
J.T.S. *Journal of Theological Studies*
J.W.H. *Journal of World History* (cf. *Cah. H.M.*)
K. Bo. *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*
K.F. *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*
K.U.B. *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazköi*
M.A.O.G. *Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft*
M.D.O.G. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*
Mél. Bibl. A. Robert. *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en honneur de A. Robert*
Mél. Dussaud. *Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. R. Dussaud*
Mél. Maspero. *Mélanges Maspero* (*Mem. Inst. fr. Caire 66–8*)
Mém. Ac. Inscr. B.-L. *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*
Mém. D.P. *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*
Mém. Inst. fr. Caire. *Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire*

Mém. Miss. fr. Caire. *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission archéologique française au Caire*
Mem. Mus. Civ. St. Nat. Ven. Trident. *Memorie del Museo di Storia Naturale della Venezia Tridentina*
Misc. Ac. Berolinensia. *Miscellanea Academica Berolinensia*
Mitt. deutsch. Inst. Kairo. *Mitteilungen des deutschen Instituts für ägyptische Altertumskunde in Kairo*
Mitt. Inst. Or. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*
M.M.A. *Metropolitan Museum of Art* (New York)
Mus. Helv. *Museum Helveticum*
M.U.S.J. *Mélanges de l'Université St-Joseph, Beyrouth*
M.V.Ae.G. *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft*
Nachr. Göttingen. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*
N.C. *La Nouvelle Clio*
Nederl. Theol. Tijdschrift. *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*
Num. Chron. *Numismatic Chronicle*
O.I.C. *Oriental Institute Communications*
O.I.P. *Oriental Institute Publications*
Ö.J.H. *Österreichische Jahreshefte*
O.L.Z. *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*
Op. Arch. *Opuscula Archaeologica, Acta Instituti Romani Regni Sueciae*
Op. Ath. *Opuscula Atheniensia, Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae*
Or. *Orientalia*
Or. antiq. *Oriens antiquus*
Or. Suecana. *Orientalia Suecana*
P.A.E. Πρακτικὰ τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἑταιρείας
P.B.S. *Publications of the Babylonian Section, The University Museum, University of Pennsylvania*
P.E.F. *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*
P.E.Q. *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
P.J.B. *Palästina Jahrbuch*
P.P.S. *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society*
Prähist. Zeitschr. *Prähistorische Zeitschrift*
Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*
Proc. Brit. Acad. *Proceedings of the British Academy*
Proc. Camb. Philol. Soc. *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*
P.W. *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll-Mittelhaus, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
Q.D.A.P. *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities of Palestine*
R.A. *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*
R.D.A.C. *Report of the Department of Antiquities, Cyprus*
Rec. trav. *Recueil de travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*
Rend. Acc. Napoli *Rendiconti Accademia Napoli*
Rev. anth. *Revue anthropologique*
Rev. arch. *Revue archéologique*
Rev. bibl. *Revue biblique*
Rev. de Guimarães. *Revista de Guimarães*
Rev. d'égyptol. *Revue d'égyptologie*
Rev. des Arts. *Revue des Arts*
Rev. d'hist. et philos. relig. *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*

Rev. ét. anc. *Revue des études anciennes*
Rev. ét. lig. *Revue des études ligures*
Rev. hist. *Revue historique*
Rev. hist. rel. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*
Revue arch. de l'Est et du Centre-Est. *Revue archéologique de l'Est et du Centre-Est*
R.H.A. *Revue hittite et asianique*
Riv. Arch. Comense. *Rivista archeologica dell'antica provincia e diocesi di Como*
Riv. di Scienze Preistoriche. *Rivista di Scienze Preistoriche*
Riv. stud. or. *Rivista degli studi orientali*
R.L.A. *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*
S.A.O.C. *Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*
Sitzungsb. Berlin (München etc.). *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen (Bayerischen etc.) Akademie der Wissenschaften*
Theol. Rundschau. *Theologische Rundschau*
Theol. St. Kr. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*
Theol. Stud. *Theological Studies*
Theol. Zeitschr. *Theologische Zeitschrift*
T.L.Z. *Theologische Literaturzeitung*
Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*
Türk. Hist. Gesell. Veröff. *Veröffentlichungen der Türkischen Historischen Gesellschaft*
U.E. *Ur Excavations*
U.E.T. *Ur Excavations: Texts*
Unters. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Ältertumskunde Ägyptens*
Urk. *Urkunden des ägyptischen Altertums*
V.A.B. *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*
V.T. *Vetus Testamentum*
We. Or. *Die Welt des Orients*
Westminster Theol. Journ. *Westminster Theological Journal*
Wien. St. *Wiener Studien*
Wiss. Zeitschr. Halle. *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg*
W.V.D.O.G. *Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*
W.Z.K.M. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
Y.O.S. *Yale Oriental Series*
Z.A. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie*
Z.Ä.S. *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*
Z.A.W. *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
Z.D.M.G. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*
Z.D.P.V. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*
Z.E. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie*
Z.f. Kirchl. Wiss. u. Kirchl. Leben. *Zeitschrift für Kirchliche Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben*
Z.f. Theol u. Kirche. *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

21. Wace, A. J. B. [Reports on excavation of houses at Mycenae.] In *B.S.A.* 48 (1953), 9 ff.; 49 (1954), 233 ff.; 50 (1955), 180 ff.; 51 (1956), 107 ff.; 52 (1957), 193 ff.
22. Waterhouse, H., and Hope-Simpson, R. 'Prehistoric Laconia, Part I.' In *B.S.A.* 55 (1960), 67–107.

A. ADDENDA

1. Blegen, C. W. and Rawson, M. *The Palace of Nestor at Pylos in Western Messenia*. Vol. 1, *The Buildings and their Contents*. Princeton, 1966.
2. Mylonas, G. E. *Mycenae and the Mycenaean Age*. Princeton, 1966.
3. Taylour, W. D. T. 'A note on the recent excavations at Mycenae, and the scheme proposed for their publication.' In *B.S.A.* 64 (1969), 259–60.

CHAPTER XXVIII

I. THE SEA PEOPLES

1. Albright, W. F. 'Dunand's New Byblos Volume: A Lycian at the Byblian Court.' In *Bull.A.S.O.R.* 155 (1959), 31 ff.
2. Astour, M. C. *Hellenosemitica*. Leiden, 1965.
3. Astour, M. C. 'New Evidence on the Last Days of Ugarit.' In *A.J.A.* 69 (1965), 253 ff.
4. Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Records of Egypt*, III–IV. Chicago, 1906.
5. Carpenter, R. *Discontinuity in Greek Civilization*. Cambridge, 1966.
6. Gardiner, Sir A. *Ancient Egyptian Onomastica*, I (200–5, The Battle of Kadesh). Oxford, 1947.
7. Gardiner, Sir A. *The Ḳadesh Inscriptions of Ramesses II*. Oxford, 1960.
8. Hall, H. R. 'The Peoples of the Sea.' In *Recueil d'études égyptologiques dédiées à... Champollion*, 297 ff. Paris, 1922.
9. Helck, H. W. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Wiesbaden, 1962.
10. Knudtzon, J. A. *Die El-Amarna Tafeln*. Leipzig, 1915.
11. Kuentz, C. *La Bataille de Qadech* (*Mém. Inst. fr. Caire*, 55). Cairo, 1928.
12. Nougayrol, J. *Le Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, III, IV. Paris, 1955–6.
13. Pritchard, J. B. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, 1954.
14. Pritchard, J. B. *The Ancient Near East in Pictures relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, 1954.
15. Riis, P. J. 'L'Activité de la Mission Archéologique Danoise sur la Côte Phénicienne.' In *Ann. Arch. de Syrie*, 8–9 (1954–9) and 10 (1960).
16. Riis, P. J. *Hama*, III, 3. *Les Cimetières à Crémation*. Copenhagen, 1948.
17. Vercoutter, J. *L'Égypte et le Monde Égéen Préhellénique* (*Inst. fr. Caire, Bibliothèque d'Études*, 22). Cairo, 1956.
18. Woolley, C. L. *Alalakh. An Account of the Excavations at Tell Atchana in the Hatay, 1937–1949*. Oxford, 1955.
19. Wreszinski, W. *Atlas zur Altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte*, Part II. Leipzig, 1935.
20. Yadin, Y. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands*. 2 vols. New York, 1963.

II. SHERDEN, SARDINIA

1. Guido, M. *Sardinia*. London, 1963.
2. Grosjean, R. 'Recent Work in Corsica.' In *Antiq.* 40 (1966), 190 ff. and pls. XXIX–XXXI.

III. SHEKLESH

1. Brea, L. B. *Sicily before the Greeks*. London, 1957.
2. Wainwright, G. A. 'Sheklesh or Shasu?' In *J.E.A.* 50 (1964), 40 ff.
3. Wainwright, G. A. 'Some Sea-Peoples.' In *J.E.A.* 47 (1961), 71 ff.

IV. ANATOLIA, DANAOI, DNNYM

1. Barnett, R. D. 'Mopsos.' In *J.H.S.* 73 (1953), 140 ff.
2. Bossert, H. T. *Asia*. Istanbul, 1946.
3. Bossert, H. T. *Ein Hethitisches Königssiegel*. Istanbuler Forschungen 17, Berlin 1944.
4. Bossert, H. T. 'Die phönizisch-hethitischen Bilinguen I.' In *Oriens*, I (1948), 163 ff.; II in *Arch. Orient.* 3 (1950), 10 ff.; III in *J.K.F.* I (1951), 265 ff.; 4 in *J.K.F.* 2 (1952–3), 167 ff. and 293 ff.
5. Dupont-Sommer, A. 'Étude du texte phénicien des inscriptions de Karatepe.' In *Oriens*, I (1948), 193 ff.; *Arch. Orient.* 18 (1950), 43 ff.; *J.K.F.* 2 (1951–3), 189 ff.
6. Eilers, W. 'Das Volk der Karkā in den Achämenideninschriften.' In *O.L.Z.* 38 (1935), 201 ff.
7. Garstang, J. *Prehistoric Mersin*. Oxford, 1953.
8. Garstang, J. and Gurney, O. R. *The Geography of the Hittite Empire*. London, 1959.
9. Götze, A. *Madduwattaš* (*M.V.Ae.G.* 32). Leipzig, 1928.
10. Goldman, H. *Excavations at Gözlu Küle, Tarsus*, II and III. Princeton, 1956 and 1963.
11. Holland, L. B. 'The Danaoi.' In *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.* 39 (1928), 59 ff.
12. Houwink ten Cate, Ph. H. J. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera during the Hellenistic Period* (*Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui*, 10). Leiden, 1961.
13. Kretschmer, P. 'Die Hypachäer.' In *Glotta*, 21 (1932), 213 ff.
14. Kretschmer, P. 'Nochmals die Hypachäer und Alaksanduš.' In *Glotta* 24 (1936), 203 ff.
15. Landsberger, B. *Sam'al, Studien zur Entdeckung der Ruinenstätte Karatepe*. Erste Lieferung. (*Türk. Hist. Gesell. Veröff.* 7, 16). Ankara, 1948.
16. Malamat, A. 'Western Asia Minor in the Time of the Sea Peoples.' In *Yediot Bahaqirat Eretz Israel Weatiqoteha*, 30 (1966), 195 ff. (in Hebrew).
17. Mellink, M. J. 'Report on the First Campaign of Excavations at Karataş-Semayük.' In *Türk. Arkeoloji Dergisi*, 13 (1964), 97 ff.
18. Otten, H. 'Neue Quellen zum Ausklang des hethitischen Reiches.' In *M.D.O.G.* 94 (1963), 1 ff.
19. Wainwright, G. A. 'Caphtor, Cappadocia.' In *V.T.* 6, 2 (1956), 200 ff.
20. Wainwright, G. A. 'Caphtor, Keftiu and Cappadocia.' In *P.E.F.* (1931), 203 ff.
21. Wainwright, G. A. 'Keftiu.' In *J.E.A.* 17 (1931), 26 ff.
22. Wainwright, G. A. 'Keftiu and Karamania (Asia Minor).' In *A.St.* 4 (1954), 38 ff.

23. Wainwright, G. A. 'Keftiu: Crete or Cilicia?' In *J.H.S.* 57 (1931), 1 ff.
24. Wainwright, G. A. 'The Keftiu People of the Egyptian Monuments.' In *Ann. Arch. Anthr.* 6 (1913), 24 ff.
25. Xanthus. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (ed. C. and Th. Müller), 1. Paris, 1841.

V. AHHIYAWA

1. Carruba, O. 'Wo lag Ahhiyawa?' In *Compte-rendu du XIème Rencontre Ass.* (Leiden, 1964).
2. Desborough, V. R. d'A. *The Last Myceneans and their Successors.* Oxford, 1964.
3. Huxley, G. L. *Achaeans and Hittites.* Oxford, 1960.
4. Sommer, F. *Die Aḫḫijavā–Urkunden* (*Abh. München*, n.F. 6, 1932).
5. Steiner, G. 'Die Ahhiyawa Frage heute.' In *Saeculum*, 15 (1964), 365 ff.
6. Ventris, M. G. F. and Chadwick, J. *Documents in Mycenaean Greek.* Cambridge, 1956.
7. Vermeule, E. *Greece in the Bronze Age.* Chicago, 1964.

VI. CYPRUS

1. Dikaios, P. 'The Bronze Statue of a Horned god from Enkomi.' In *J.D.A.I.* Heft 1 (1962), 1 ff.
2. Dikaios, P. 'Excavations and Historical Background: Enkomi in Cyprus.' *Journal of Historical Studies*, Autumn, 1967.
3. Karagheorghis, V. 'Recent Archaeological Investigations at Kition.' In *Κυπριακαὶ Σπουδαί* (Nicosia, 1962).
4. Schaeffer, C. F. A. *Enkomi-Alasia* I. Paris, 1952.
5. Schaeffer, C. F. A. 'Götter der Nord und Inselvölker in Zypern.' In *Arch. f. Or.* 21 (1966), 59 ff.
6. Schaeffer, C. F. A. *Ugaritica* V. Paris, 1949.
7. Sjøqvist, E. *Problems of the Late Cypriot Bronze Age.* Stockholm, 1940.
8. Wainwright, G. A. 'A Teucrian at Salamis in Cyprus.' In *J.H.S.* 83 (1963), 146 ff.

VII. THE PHILISTINES

1. Aharoni, Y. *The Land of the Bible: a Historical Geography.* London, 1967.
2. Albright, W. F. 'Some Oriental Glosses on the Homeric Problem.' In *A.J.A.* 54 (1950), 162 ff.
3. Bonfante, G. 'Who were the Philistines?' In *A.J.A.* 50 (1946), 251 ff.
4. Dothan, M. and Friedman, D. N. *Ashdod I. The First Season of Excavations, 2* (*'Atiqot* VII). Jerusalem, 1967.
5. Dothan, T. 'Archaeological Reflections on the Philistine Problem.' In *The Holy Land* (*Antiquity and Survival* (ed. W. A. Ruysch) II, 2/3, 151 ff.). The Hague and Jerusalem, 1957.
6. Dothan, T. *Ha-pelishtim ve-tarbutam ha-ḥomrit.* [*The Philistines and their Material Culture.*] Jerusalem, 1967. (In Hebrew, with English summary.)
7. Eissfeldt, O. 'Philister.' In *P.W.* 38 (1938), 2301 ff.
8. Eissfeldt, O. 'Philister und Phönizier.' In *Alte Or.* 34 (1936).
9. Erlenmeyer, M. L. and H. 'Über Philister und Kreter, I.' In *Or.* n.s. 29 (1960), 121 ff.; 241 ff.; 30 (1961), 269 ff.
10. Evans, Sir A. *Scripta Minoa*, 1. Oxford, 1909.
11. Franken, H. J. 'The Stratigraphic Context of the Clay Tablets found at Deir 'Alla.' In *P.E.Q.* 22 (1964), 79 ff.

12. Gordon, C. H. 'The Rôle of the Philistines.' In *Antiq.* 30 (1956), 22 ff.
13. Greenfield, J. C. 'Philistines.' In *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, III, K-C*, 791 ff. New York, 1962.
14. Hempel, J. 'Westliche Kultureinflüsse auf das alttestamentliche Palästina.' In *P.J.B.* 23 (1927), 52 ff.
15. Heurtley, W. A. 'The Relationship between "Philistine" and Mycenean Pottery.' In *Q.D.A.P.* 5 (1936), 90 ff.
16. Hrouda, B. 'Die Einwanderung der Philister in Palästina.' In *Vorderasiatische Archäologie: Studien und Aufsätze: Festschrift Moortgat* (1965), 126 ff.
17. Macalister, R. A. S. *The Philistines, their History and Civilization.* London, 1913.
18. Macalister, R. A. S. *The Philistines, their History and Civilisation* (reprint of 17 with an introduction by Dr Abraham Silverstein). Chicago, 1965.
19. Mazar, B. 'The Sanctuary of Arad and the Family of Hobab the Kenite.' In *J.N.E.S.* 24 (1965), 297 ff.
20. Mazar, B. 'The Philistines and the Rise of Israel and Tyre.' In *The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings*, 1, no. 7 (1964), 1 ff.
21. Mitchell, T. C. 'Philistia.' In D. Winton Thomas (ed.), *Archaeology and Old Testament Study*. Oxford, 1967.
22. Müller, M. 'Die Urheimat der Philister.' In 'Studien zur Vorderasiatischen Geschichte', *M.V.A.G.* 1 (1900), 1 ff.
23. Oppenheim, M. von. *Der Tell Halaf.* Leipzig, 1931.
24. Petrie, W. M. F. *Beth-pelet I* (*Tell Fara*). London, 1930.
25. Phythian-Adams, W. J. 'Philistine Origins in the Light of Palestinian Archaeology.' In *Bull. S.A.J.* 3 (1923), 20 ff.
26. Wright, G. E. 'Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries.' In *Bi. Or.* 22 (1959), 54 ff.
27. Waldbaum, J. 'Philistine Tombs at Tell Fara and their Aegean Prototypes.' In *A.J.A.* 70 (1966), 331 ff.

A. ADDENDA

1. Dikaios, P. *Excavations at Enkomi (1948–1958).* Mainz (1969).
2. Dothan, M. 'Excavations at Ashdod II and III.' In *I.E.J.* 18 (1968), 253–4.
3. Dothan, M. 'Ashdod II and III, 2nd and 3rd Seasons of Excavation, 1963, 1965: Soundings in 1967.' In *'Atiqot* IX–X (1971).
4. Dothan, M., Perlman, I. and Asaro, F. 'An introductory study of Mycenaean III C 1 ware from Tel Ashdod.' In *Archaeometry* 13 (1971), 169 ff.
5. Dothan, T. 'Anthropoid Clay Coffins from a Late Bronze Age Cemetery near Deir-el-Balah: Preliminary Report I.' In *I.E.J.* 22 (1972), 65 ff.
6. Dothan, T. *Idem*, Preliminary Report II. In *I.E.J.* 23 (1973.), 129 ff.
7. Hestrin, R. *The Philistines and the other Sea Peoples.* (The Israel Museum, Jerusalem, 1970: Cat. no. 68.)
8. James, F. W. *The Iron Age at Beth Shan. A Study of Levels VI–IV* (University of Pennsylvania, Museum Monographs). Philadelphia, 1960.
9. Karageorghis, V. 'The Mycenaeans at Kition: a preliminary survey.' In *Studi Ciprioti e Rapporti di Scavo*, 1, (1971), 217 ff. 495 ff.
10. Malamat, A. 'The Egyptian Decline in Canaan and the Sea Peoples.' In *The World History of the Jewish People* (ed. B. Mazar), ch. II. First Series: Ancient Times, Vol. III. Tel Aviv (1971).
11. Mellink, M. 'Excavations at Karataş-Semayuk in Lycia.' In *A.J.A.* 23 (1969), 320 ff.

12. Otten, H. *Sprachliche Stellung und Datierung der Madduwatta-Textes*. Studien zu den Bogazköy-Texten, Heft 11. Wiesbaden, 1969.
13. Vaux, R. de 'La Phénicie et les peuples de la mer.' In *Mélanges de l'Université St. Joseph*, 45 (1969), 481 ff.

CHAPTER XXIX

GENERAL

1. Bork, F., Hüsing, G. and König, F. W. *Corpus Inscriptionum Elamicarum*. Hannover, 1926.
2. Cameron, G. G. *History of Early Iran*. Chicago, 1936.
3. Delaporte, L. *L'Iran antique*. Paris, 1943.
4. Dhorme, E. 'Élam, Élamites.' In *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément II, 920 ff. Paris, 1934.
5. König, F. W. 'Geschichte Elams.' In *Alte Or.* 29, 4 (Leipzig, 1931).
6. König, F. W. 'Elam.' In *R.L.A.* 2 (1938).
7. *Mémoires de la Délégation en Perse*. Paris, 1900–
8. Pézard, M. *Les Antiquités de la Susiane*. Paris, Musée du Louvre, 1913.

I. REIGNS AND EVENTS

1. Gelb, I. J. *Hurrians and Subarians*. Chicago, 1944.
2. Gelb, I. J. 'Hurrians at Nippur in the Sargonic Period.' In *Festschrift Johannes Friedrich* (Heidelberg, 1959), 187 ff.
3. Hilprecht, H. V. *Old Babylonian Inscriptions* (*B.E.* series A, 1). Philadelphia, 1893.
4. Hüsing, G. *Die einheimischen Quellen zur Geschichte Elams*. Leipzig, 1916.
5. King, L. W. *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*. London, 1907.
6. König, F. W. 'Drei altelamische Stelen.' In *M.V.A.G.* 30 (1925).
7. König, F. W. 'Pinikir.' In *Arch. f. Or.* 5 (1928–9), 101 ff.
8. Ungnad, A. 'Urkunden aus Dilbat.' In *B.A.* 6, 5 (1909).
9. Weidner, E. F. 'Die Inschriften Tukulti-Ninurtas I.' In *Arch. f. Or.* Beiheft 12 (1959).

II. ARCHITECTURE AND THE ARTS

1. Ghirshman, R. Principal articles describing the excavations at Choga-Zanbil in *Ill. Ldn News*, 5229 (1952), 954 ff.; 5964 (1953), 226 f.; 6011 (1954), 13 ff.; 6062 (1955), 1140 f.; 6118 (1956), 387 ff.; 6162 (1957), 76 ff.; 6262 (1959), 1025 ff.; 6269 (1959), 319. In *C.-R. Ac. Inscr. B.-L.* 1954, 233 ff.; 1955, 112, 322 ff.; 1957, 231 ff. In *Rev. Arch.* 42 (1953), 1 ff.; 44 (1954), 1 ff.; 46 (1955), 63 ff.; 49 (1957), 1 ff. In *Rev. des Arts*, 4 (1954), 169 f. In *Arts Asiatiques*, 1 (1954), 83 ff.; 2 (1955), 163 ff.; 3 (1956), 163 ff.; 4 (1957), 113 ff. In *Ars Orientalis*, 1 (1954), 173 ff. In *Archaeology*, 8 (1955), 260 ff. In *Les Cahiers techniques de l'Art* (Strasbourg), 3 (1956), 31 ff. In *Rev. de l'Enseignement supérieur*, 3 (1959), 101 ff.
2. Le Breton, L. 'The Early Period at Susa: Mesopotamian Relations.' In *Iraq*, 19 (1957), 79 ff.
3. Parrot, A. *Ziggourats et 'Tour de Babel'*. Paris, 1949.

18. Herzfeld, E. *Archaeological History of Iran*. London, 1935.
19. Herzfeld, E. 'Die Kunst des zweiten Jahrtausends in Vorderasien.' In *A.M.I.* 8, no. 3 (1937).
20. Herzfeld, E. *Iran in the Ancient East*. Oxford, 1941.
21. Hüsing, G. *Der Zagros und seine Völker* (*Alte* Or. 9, Heft 3/4). Leipzig, 1908.
22. Kupper, J.-R. *Les Nomades en Mesopotamie au temps des rois de Mari*. Paris, 1957.
23. Læssøe, J. *The Shemshāra Tablets*. Copenhagen, 1959.
24. Minorski, V. 'Les études historiques et géographiques sur la Perse depuis 1900.' In *Acta Or.* 10 (1932), 278 ff.
25. Mironov, N. P. 'Aryan Vestiges in the Near East of the Second millennary B.C.' In *Acta Or.* 11 (1932), 140 ff.
26. Olmstead, A. T. *History of the Persian Empire*. Chicago, 1948.
27. Poebel, A. 'Eine sumerische Inschrift Samsuilunas über die Erbauung der Festung Dur-Samsuiluna.' In *Arch. f. Or.* 9 (1933–4), 241 ff.
28. Rawlinson, H. C. *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, v. London, 1884.
29. Rogers, R. W. *A History of Ancient Persia*. New York, 1929.
30. Sarre, F. *L'art de la Perse ancienne*. Paris, 1921.
31. Schmidt, E. F. *Excavations at Tepe Hissar Damghan*. Philadelphia, 1937.
32. Speiser, E. A. *Southern Kurdistan in the Annals of Ashurnasirpal and To-day* (*Ann. A.S.O.R.* 8, 1926–7). New Haven, 1928.
33. Speiser, E. A. 'Hurrians and Subarians.' In *J.A.O.S.* 68 (1948), 1 f.
34. Streck, M. 'Armenien, Kurdistan, und Westpersien nach den babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften.' In *Z.A.* 13 (1898), 57 ff.; 14 (1899), 103 ff.; 15 (1900), 257 ff.
35. Thureau-Dangin, F. 'La fin de la domination gutienne.' In *R.A.* 9 (1912), 111 ff.
36. Thureau-Dangin, F. 'Un double de l'inscription d'Utuhegal.' In *R.A.* 10 (1913), 98 ff.
37. Thureau-Dangin, F. *Une relation de la huitième campagne de Sargon*. Paris, 1912.
38. Ungnad, A. *Subartu*. Berlin, 1936.
39. Vanden Berghe, L. 'Iran. De stand van de archaeologische onderzoekingen in Iran.' In *J.E.O.L.* 13 (1953–4), 347 ff.
40. Vanden Berghe, L. *Archéologie de l'Iran ancien*. Leyden, 1959.
41. Von der Osten, H. *Die Welt der Perser*. Stuttgart, 1956.
42. Wilkinson, Ch. K. 'Two Ancient Silver Vessels.' In *Bull. M.M.A.* 15 (1956–7), 9 ff.
43. Witzel, P. Maurus. 'Bemerkungen zu der Siegesinschrift Utuhegals von Uruk.' In *Babyloniaca*, 7 (1913–23), 51 ff.
44. Wulsin, F. R. *Excavations at Turang-Tepe, near Asterabad* (*Bull. Amer. Inst for Persian Art and Arch.* Suppl., 1932).

CHAPTER XXXIII

G. GENERAL

1. Albright, W. F. 'Syrien, Phönizien und Palästina.' In *Historia Mundi*, II, 331 ff. Berne, 1953.
2. Albright, W. F. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*. New York, 1963.

3. Bilabel, F. *Geschichte Vorderasiens und Ägyptens vom 16–11 Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Heidelberg, 1927.
4. Breasted, J. H. *Ancient Records of Egypt*, I–V. Chicago, 1906.
5. Erman, A. und Grapow, H. *Wörterbuch der ägyptischen Sprache*, 5 vols. Leipzig, 1928–31.
6. Friedrich, J. *Phönizisch-punische Grammatik.* Rome, 1951.
7. Gordon, C. H. *Before the Bible.* New York, 1962.
8. Harris, Z. S. *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language.* New Haven, 1937.
9. *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. G. A. Buttrick). Nashville, Tennessee, 1962.
10. Luckenbill, D. D. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia: Historical Records of Assyria*, I–II. Chicago, 1926–7.
11. Meyer, E. *Geschichte des Altertums*, II, 1, 2. Stuttgart and Berlin, 1928, 1931.
12. Olmstead, A. T. *History of Palestine and Syria.* New York, 1941.

I. THE SEA PEOPLES IN PALESTINE

1. Albright, W. F. 'A Colony of Cretan Mercenaries on the Coast of the Negeb.' In *J.P.O.S.* 1 (1921), 187 ff.
2. Albright, W. F. 'Egypt and the Early History of the Negeb.' In *J.P.O.S.* 4 (1924), 131 ff.
3. Albright, W. F. In *Ann. A.S.O.R.* 12 (1932), 53 ff.
4. Albright, W. F. *The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography* (*Amer. Orient. Ser.* 5). New Haven, 1934.
5. Albright, W. F. 'Some Oriental Glosses on the Homeric Problem.' In *A.J.A.* 54 (1950), 162 ff.
6. Albright, W. F. 'The Eastern Mediterranean about 1060 B.C.' In *Studies Presented to David Moore Robinson.* St Louis, 1951.
7. Albright, W. F. *The Archaeology of Palestine* (*Pelican Archaeology Series*). London, 1949–63, esp. 1954 edition.
8. Bossert, H. Th. *Altkreta.* Berlin, 1923.
9. Burn, A. R. *Minoans, Philistines, and Greeks.* London, 1930.
10. Carruba, O. 'Lydisch und Lyder.' In *Mitt. Inst. Or.* 8 (1963), 383 ff.
11. Desborough, V. R. d'A. *The Last Mycenaeans and Their Successors.* Oxford, 1964.
12. Dothan, T. 'Philistine Civilization in the Light of Archaeological Finds in Palestine and Egypt.' In *Eretz-Israel*, 5 (1958), 55 ff. (in Hebrew).
13. Dothan, T. 'Archaeological Reflections on the Philistine Problem.' In *The Holy Land* (*Antiquity and Survival*, II, 2/3, 151 ff.). The Hague and Jerusalem, 1957.
14. Edgerton, W. F. and Wilson, J. A. *Historical Records of Ramses III. The Texts in Medinet Habu*, I–II. Chicago, 1936.
15. Eissfeldt, O. 'Philister.' In *P.W.* 19 (1938), cols. 2390–2402.
16. Erlenmeyer, M. L. and Erlenmeyer, H. 'Über Philister und Kreter. I.' In *Or.* n.s. 29 (1960), 121 ff.
17. Erlenmeyer, M. L. and Erlenmeyer, H. 'Über Philister und Kreter. II.' In *Or.* n.s. 29 (1960), 241 ff.
18. Erlenmeyer, M. L. and Erlenmeyer, H. 'Über Philister und Kreter. III.' In *Or.* n.s. 30 (1961), 269 ff.
19. Erlenmeyer, M. L. and Erlenmeyer, H. 'Über Philister und Kreter. IV.' In *Or.* n.s. 33 (1964), 199 ff.
20. Goetze, A. 'Cilicians.' In *J.C.S.* 16 (1962), 48 ff.

21. Grant, E. and Wright, G. E. *Ain Shems Excavations*, v. Haverford (Penna.), 1939.
22. Hall, H. R. 'The Peoples of the Sea.' In *Mélanges Champollion*, 297 ff. Paris, 1922.
23. Helck, W. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (*Ägyptologische Abhandlungen*, 5). Wiesbaden, 1962.
24. Heurtley, W. A. 'The Relationship between "Philistine" and Mycenaean Pottery.' In *Q.D.A.P.* 5 (1936), 90 ff.
25. Landes, G. M. 'The Material Civilization of the Ammonites.' In *Bi. Ar.* 24 (1961), 66 ff.
26. Macalister, R. A. S. *The Philistines*. London, 1913.
27. Mazar, B. 'The Philistines and the Rise of Israel and Tyre.' In *The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings*, 1, 7 (1964), 1 ff.
28. Naveh, J. 'Khirbat al-Muqanna'-Ekron: an archaeological survey.' In *I.E.J.* 8 (1958), 87 ff. and 165 ff.
29. Nelson, H. H. *Medinet Habu, 1924–28* (*O.I.C.* 5). Chicago, 1929.
30. Nelson, H. H. and others. *Medinet Habu*, I–II (*O.I.P.* 8–9). Chicago, 1930–32.
31. Petrie, W. M. F. *Gerar*. London, 1928.
32. Petrie, W. M. F. *Beth-pelet I*. London, 1930.
33. Phythian-Adams, W. J. 'Philistine Origins in the Light of Palestinian Archaeology.' In *Bull. B.S.A.J.* 3 (1923), 20 ff.
34. Saussey, E. 'La céramique philistine.' In *Syria*, 5 (1924), 169 ff.
35. Stähelin, F. *Die Philister*. Basel, 1918.
36. Starkey, J. L. and Harding, L. *Beth-pelet II*. London, 1932.
37. Ten Cate, Ph. H. J. H. *The Luwian Population Groups of Lycia and Cilicia Aspera During the Hellenistic Period* (*Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui*, 10). Leiden, 1961.
38. Watzinger, C. *Denkmäler Palästinas*, I. Leipzig, 1933, 77 ff.
39. Wilson, J. A. *Medinet Habu 1928–1929: the language of the historical texts commemorating Ramses III*. (*O.I.C.* 7.) Chicago, 1930.
40. Wright, G. E. 'Iron: the Date of Its Introduction into Common Use in Palestine.' In *A.J.A.* 43 (1939), 458 ff.
41. Wright, G. E. *Biblical Archaeology*. Philadelphia and London, 1957.
42. Wright, G. E. 'Philistine Coffins and Mercenaries.' In *Bi. Ar.* 22 (1959), 54 ff.
43. Yoyotte, J. 'Un souvenir du "Pharaon" Taousert en Jordanie.' In *V.T.* 12 (1962), 464 ff.

II. THE CANAANITE REVIVAL IN PHOENICIA

1. Albright, W. F. 'New Light on the Early History of Phoenician Colonization.' In *Bull. A.S.O.R.* 83 (1941), 14 ff.
2. Albright, W. F. 'The Phoenician Inscriptions of the Tenth Century B.C. from Byblos.' In *J.A.O.S.* 67 (1947), 153 ff.
3. Albright, W. F. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (3rd ed.). Baltimore, 1953.
4. Albright, W. F. 'Was the Age of Solomon without Monumental Art?' In *Eretz-Israel*, 5 (1958), 1 ff.
5. Albright, W. F. 'The Role of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization.' In *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. G. E. Wright), 328 ff. New York, 1961.

6. Barnett, R. D. 'The Nimrud Ivories and the Art of the Phoenicians.' In *Iraq*, 2 (1935), 179 ff.
7. Barnett, R. D. *A Catalogue of the Nimrud Ivories in the British Museum*. London, 1957.
8. Bass, G. F. 'A Bronze Age Shipwreck.' In *Expedition* (Philadelphia), 3 (1961), 2 ff.
9. Bonsor, J. E. *Early Engraved Ivories*. New York, 1928.
10. Bosch-Gimpera, P. 'Fragen der Chronologie der phönizischen Kolonisation in Spanien.' In *Klio*, 1928, 345 ff.
11. Černý, J. *ap*. Posener, G. 'Les richesses inconnues de la littérature égyptienne.' In *Rev. égyptol*. 6 (1949), 41.
12. Černý, J. *Paper and Books in Ancient Egypt*. London, 1952.
13. Chiappisi, S. *Il Melqart di Sciacca e la Questione fenicia in Sicilia*, Rome, 1961.
14. Contenau, G. *La Civilisation phénicienne*. Paris, 1939.
15. Covey-Crump, W. W. 'The Situation of Tarshish.' In *J.T.S.* 17 (1916), 280 ff.
16. Dawkins, R. M. *The Sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta*. London, 1929.
17. Dunand, M. *Fouilles de Byblos*, I. Paris, 1939.
18. Dunand, M. *Byblia Grammata*. Beyrouth, 1945.
19. Dunand, M. 'Phénicie.' In *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Paris, 1961.
20. Dussaud, R. 'Les inscriptions phéniciennes du tombeau d'Ahiram, roi de Byblos.' In *Syria*, 5 (1924), 135 ff.
21. Dussaud, R. 'Dédicace d'une statue d'Osorkon Ier par Elibaal, roi de Byblos.' In *Syria*, 6 (1925), 101 ff.
22. Eissfeldt, O. 'Philister und Phönizier.' In *Alte Or.* 34 (1936).
23. Eissfeldt, O. 'Phoiniker, Phoinikia.' In *P.W.* 20 (1941), cols. 350–380.
24. Garbini, G. 'L'espansione fenicia nel mediterraneo.' In *Cultura e scuola*, 7 (1963), 92 ff.
25. Glueck, N. *The Other Side of the Jordan*. New Haven, 1940.
26. Harden, D. B. *The Phoenicians*. London, 1962.
27. Hennequin, L. 'Fouilles en Phénicie.' In *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, III. cols. 436–470. Paris, 1936.
28. Loud, G. *The Megiddo Ivories* (*O.I.P.* 52). Chicago, 1939.
29. Maisler, B. 'The Phoenician Inscriptions from Gebal and the Evolution of the Phoenico-Hebrew Alphabetic Script.' In *Leshonenu*, 14 (1936), 166 ff. (in Hebrew).
30. Mertzenfeld, C. de. 'Les ivoires de Megiddo.' In *Syria*, 19 (1938), 345 ff.
31. Montet, P. *Byblos et l'Egypte*. Paris, 1928.
32. Moscati, S. 'La Questione Fenicia.' In *Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, serie 8, vol. 8 (1963), 483 ff.
33. Pietschmann, R. *Geschichte der Phönizier*. Berlin, 1889.
34. Poulsen, F. *Der Orient und die frühgriechische Kunst*. Leipzig, 1912.
35. Prakken, D. W. *Studies in Greek Genealogical Chronology*. Lancaster (Penna.), 1943.
36 Thomsen, P. Articles in Ebert, M. *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*: 'Byblos', II (1926), 246 ff.; 'Sidon', XII (1928), 77 ff.; 'Tyrus', XIII (1929), 516 ff.
37. Vincent, L. H. 'Les fouilles de Byblos.' In *Rev. bibl.* 34 (1925), 161 ff.
38. Watzinger, C. 'Phönikien und Palästina: Blütezeit.' In Otto, W. *Handbuch der Archäologie*, I, 805 ff. Munich, 1939.

III. THE SYRO-HITTITE STATES

1. Akurgal, E. *Remarques stylistiques sur les reliefs de Malatya*. Istanbul, 1946.
2. Albright, W. F. 'Northeast-Mediterranean Dark Ages and the Early Iron Age Art of Syria.' In *The Aegean and the Near East: Studies presented to Hetty Goldman*, 144 ff. New York, 1956.
3. Albright, W. F. 'The date of the Kapara Period at Gozan (Tell Halaf).' In *A.St.* 6 (1956), 75 ff.
4. Albright, W. F. 'The Biblical tribe of Massa and some Congeners.' In *Studi Orientalistici...Giorgio Levi Della Vida* (Rome, 1956), 1 ff.
5. Austin, W. M. 'Is Armenian an Anatolian Language?' In *Language*, 18 (1942), 22 ff.
6. Bérard, J. 'Philistins et Préhellènes.' In *Rev. arch.* série 6, 37 (1951), 129 ff.
7. Bossert, H. Th. *Altanatolien*. Berlin, 1942.
8. Bossert, H. Th. *Karatepe*. Istanbul, 1946.
9. Bossert, H. Th. 'Zur Chronologie der Skulpturen von Malatya.' In *Felsefe Arkivi*, 2 (1947), 85 ff.
10. Bossert, H. Th. 'Zur Geschichte von Karkamis.' In *Studi Classici e Orientali*, 1 (1951), 35 ff.
11. Bossert, H. Th. *Altsyrien*. Tübingen, 1951.
12. Bowman, R. A. 'The Old Canaanite Alphabet at Tell Halaf: the Date of the Altar Inscription.' In *A.J.S.L.* 58 (1941), 359 ff.
13. Christian, V. 'Untersuchungen zur nordsyrisch-"hettitischen" Kunst.' In *Arch. f. Or.* 9 (1933–4), 1 ff.
14. Contenau, G. *La civilisation des Hittites et des Mitanniens*. Paris, 1934.
15. Dupont-Sommer, A. *Les Araméens*. Paris, 1949.
16. Février, J. G. 'L'ancienne marine phénicienne.' In *N.C.* 1/2 (1950), 128 ff.
17. Forrer, E. Article, 'Aramu'. In *R.L.A.* 1 (1929), 131 ff.
18. Forrer, E. Article, 'Assyrien'. In *R.L.A.* 1 (1930), 282 ff.
19. Franken, H. J. 'Deir 'Alla 14–4–1964.' In *V.T.* 14 (1964), 377 ff.
20. Frankfort, H. *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (*The Pelican History of Art*). Baltimore, 1955.
21. Garstang, J. *The Hittite Empire*. London, 1929.
22. Gelb, I. *Hittite Hieroglyphs*, I–III. Chicago, 1931–42.
23. Güterbock, H. G. and Özgüç, N. *Guide to the Hittite Museum in the Bedestan at Ankara*. Istanbul, 1946.
24. Hogarth, D. G. and Woolley, C. L. *Carchemish*, I–II. London, 1914–21.
25. Hrozný, B. *Les inscriptions hittites-hiéroglyphiques*, I–III. Praha, 1933–7.
26. Kraeling, E. G. H. *Aram and Israel*. New York, 1918.
27. Laroche, E. 'Études sur les hiéroglyphes hittites.' In *Syria*, 35, 252 ff.
28. Laroche, E. 'Les hiéroglyphes Hittites.' In *L'écriture*, 35 (1960), 1 ff.
29. Luschan, F. von and others. *Ausgraben in Sendschirli*, I–V. Berlin, 1893–1943.
30. Malamat, A. *The Aramaeans in Aram Naharaim and the Rise of their States* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem, 1952.
31. Malamat, A. 'The Kingdom of David and Solomon in its contact with Aram Naharaim.' In *Bi. Ar.* 21 (1958), 96 ff.
32. Mazar, B. 'The Aramaean Empire and its relations with Israel.' In *Bi. Ar.* 25 (1962), 98 ff.
33. Meissner, B. 'Die Keilschrifttexte auf den steinernen Orthostaten und Statuen aus dem Tell Halaf.' In *Festschrift Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim*, 71 ff. Berlin, 1933.

34. Meriggi, P. 'Die längsten Bauinschriften in "hethitischen" Hieroglyphen nebst Glossar zu sämtlichen Texten.' In *M.V.A.G.* 39 (1934).
35. Meriggi, P. *Hieroglyphisch-Hethitisches Glossar* (2. Aufl.). Wiesbaden, 1962.
36. Moortgat, A. *Die bildende Kunst des alten Orients und die Bergvölker*. Berlin, 1932.
37. Moritz, B. 'Die Nationalität der Arumu-Stämme in Südost-Babylonien.' In *Paul Haupt Anniversary Volume* (Leipzig, 1926), 184 ff.
38. Oppenheim, Max von. *Der Tell Halaf*. Leipzig, 1931.
39. Pottier, E. *L'art hittite*, I. Paris, 1920.
40. Schiffer, S. *Die Aramäer*. Leipzig, 1911.
41. Streck, M. 'Über die älteste Geschichte der Aramäer.' In *Klio*, 6 (1906), 185 ff.
42. Unger, Merrill F. *Israel and the Aramaeans of Damascus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1957.
43. Weidner, E. F. 'Die Annalen des Königs Aššurbêlkala von Assyrien.' In *Arch. f. Or.* 6 (1930–1), 75 ff.
44. Woolley, L. and Barnett, R. D. *Carchemish*, III. London, 1952.

CHAPTER XXXIV

GENERAL

1. Albright, W. F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. Ed. 2. Baltimore, 1946.
2. Albright, W. F. 'Syrien, Phönizien und Palästina.' In *Historia Mundi*, vol. 2, 331 ff. München, 1953.
3. Albright, W. F. *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel*. Ed. 3. Baltimore, 1953.
4. Albright, W. F. *Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands*. Ed. 2. New York, 1955.
5. Albright, W. F. *The Archaeology of Palestine*. Revised and reprinted. Harmondsworth, 1960.
6. Albright, W. F. *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*. New York, Evanston, 1963.
7. Auerbach, E. *Wüste und Gelobtes Land*. Berlin, 1932.
8. Bright, J. *A History of Israel*. Philadelphia, 1959.
9. Burrows, M. *What mean these Stones?* New Haven, 1941.
10. Freedman, D. N. and Campbell, E. F. 'The Chronology of Israel and the Ancient Near East.' In *Essays W. F. Albright*, 203 ff. London, 1961.
11. Galling, K. *Biblisches Reallexikon*. Tübingen, 1937.
12. Gordon, C. H. *The World of the Old Testament*. New York, 1958.
13. Gordon, C. H. *Before the Bible*. London, 1962.
14. Gray, J. *Archaeology and the Old Testament World*. London, 1962.
15. Gressmann, H. *Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament*. Ed. 2. Berlin and Leipzig, 1926.
16. Gressmann, H. *Altorientalische Bilder zum Alten Testament*. Ed. 2. Berlin and Leipzig, 1927.
17. Grollenberg. L. H. *Atlas of the Bible*. London, 1956.
18. Herrmann, S. 'Das Werden Israels.' In *T.L.Z.* 87 (1962), 561 ff.
19. Kittel, R. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Vol. I, eds. 5–6. Gotha, 1923.
20. Kraeling, E. G. *Bible Atlas*. New York, 1961.
21. Kraus, H.-J. 'Israel.' In *Propyläen-Weltgeschichte* (eds. G. Mann and A. Heuss). Vol. 2, 237 ff. Berlin, 1962.

(A) EGYPT

Kings from the Eighteenth to the Twenty-first Dynasties

EIGHTEENTH DYNASTY: 1570–1320 B.C.

Nebpehtyre Amosis	1570–1546 B.C.
Djeserkare Amenophis I	1546–1526 B.C.
Akheperkare Tuthmosis I	1525–*c.* 1512 B.C.
Akheperenre Tuthmosis II	*c.* 1512–1504 B.C.
Makare Hatshepsut	1503–1482 B.C.
Menkheperre Tuthmosis III (21)*	1504–1450 B.C.
Akheprure Amenophis II	1450–1425 B.C.
Menkheprure Tuthmosis IV	1425–1417 B.C.
Nebmare Amenophis III	1417–1379 B.C.
Neferkheprure Amenophis IV (Akhenaten)	1379–1362 B.C.
(Ankhkheprure) Smenkhkare (3)*	1364–1361 B.C.
Nebkheprure Tutankhamun	1361–1352 B.C.
Kheperkheprure Ay	1352–1348 B.C.
Djeserkheprure Horemheb	1348–1320 B.C.

NINETEENTH DYNASTY: 1320–1200 B.C.

Menpehtyre Ramesses I	1320–1318 B.C.
Menmare Sethos I	1318–1304 B.C.
Usermare Ramesses II	1304–1237 B.C.
Baenre Merneptah	1236–1223 B.C.
Menmare Amenmesses†	1222–1217 B.C. (?)
Userkheprure Sethos II	1216–1210 B.C. (?)
Akhenre-setepenre Merneptah Siptah‡ / Sitre-meryetamun Tewosret	1209–1200 B.C. (?)

TWENTIETH DYNASTY: 1200–1085 B.C.

Userkhaure Sethnakhte	1200–1198 B.C.
Usermare-meryamun Ramesses III	1198–1166 B.C.
Usermare-setepenamun§ Ramesses IV	1166–1160 B.C.
Usermare-sekheperenre Ramesses V	1160–1156 B.C.
Nebmare-meryamun Ramesses VI	1156–1148 B.C.
Usermare-meryamun-setepenre Ramesses VII	1148–1147 B.C.
Usermare-akhenamun Ramesses VIII	1147–1140 B.C.
Neferkare-setepenre Ramesses IX	1140–1121 B.C.
Khepermare-setepenre Ramesses X	1121–1113 B.C.
Menmare-setepenptah Ramesses XI	1113–1085 B.C.

* Years of co-regency with his predecessor. † Position in Dynasty uncertain.
‡ Also named Sekhaenre Ramesses Siptah.
§ Later named Hikmare-setepenamun.

TWENTY-FIRST DYNASTY: 1085–945 B.C.

	Highest recorded year
Hedjkheperre-setepenre Smendes	—
Neferkare-hikwast Amenemnisu	—
Akheperre-setepenamun Psusennes I	19
Usermare-setepenamun Amenemope	49
Nutekheperre-setepenamun Siamun	17
Titkheprure-setepenamun Psusennes II	—

HIGH PRIESTS OF AMUN AT THEBES FROM RAMESSES XI TO PSUSENNES II

Hrihor
Piankh
Pinudjem I
Masahert
Menkheperre
Nesbenebded
Pinudjem II

(B) WESTERN ASIA, FOURTEENTH TO TENTH CENTURIES B.C.

DATE	BABYLONIA	ASSYRIA	ELAM	MITANNI	UGARIT	CARCHEMISH	AMURRU	KHATTI	ISRAEL	DATE
1390		Erība-Adad I (27) 1392–1366								1390
	Kadashman-Enlil I (son of Kurigalzu I?)			Tushratta (brother of Artashshumara) c. 1385–	Ammistamru I		'Abdi-Ashirta	Tudkhaliash III (son of Khattushilish II)		
	Burnaburiash II (29) c. 1375–1347	Ashur-uballiṭ I (36) 1365–1330			Niqmaddu II (son)		Aziru	Shuppiluliumash I (son)		
1350				Shuttarna III		Piyashilish				1350
	Karakhardash			Kurtiwaza (son of Tushratta)	Ar-Khalbu (son)	Sharre-Kushukh		Arnuwandash II (son)		
	Nazibugash							Murshilish II (brother)		
	Kurigalzu II (22) 1345–1324		Khurpatila				DU-Teshub			
		Enlil-nīrāri (10) 1329–1320	Pakhir-ishshan		Niqmepa (brother)	...-Sharruma	Tuppi-Teshub			
	Nazimaruttash (26) 1323–1298					Shakhurunuwash		Muwatallish (son)		
		Arik-dēn-ili (12) 1319–1308								
1300		Adad-nīrāri I (33) 1307–1275		Shattuara I						1300
	Kadashman-Turgu (18) 1297–1280		Attar-kittakh (brother)				Bente-shina	Urkhi-Teshub (son)	*Captivity in Egypt*	
							Shapilish			
			Khumban-numena	Wasashatta (son)				Khattushilish III (son of Murshilish II)		
	Kadashman-Enlil II (15) 1279–1265	Shalmaneser I (30) 1274–1245		Shattuara II	Ammistamru II (son)	Ini-Teshub	Bente-shina			
	Kudur-Enlil (9) 1264–1256		Untash-^{d}GAL (son)							
1250	Shagarakti-Shuriash (13) 1255–1243		Unpatar-^{d}GAL c. 1245–				Shaushga-muwash	Tudkhaliash IV (son)	*Exodus*	1250
	Kashtiliash IV (8) 1242–1235	Tukulti-Ninurta I (37) 1244–1208								

	Assyrian domination (7) 1234–1228		Kidin-khutran (brother)							
	Enlil-nādin-shumi Kadashman-Kharbe } (3) 1227–1225				Ibiranu (son)			Arnuwandash III (son)		
	Adad-shuma-iddina (6) 1224–1219									
	Adad-shuma-uṣur (30) 1218–1189	Ashur-nādin-apli (4) 1207–1204	Khallutush-In-Shushinak		Niqmaddu III (son) 'Ammurapi	Talmi-Teshub		Shuppiluliumash II (brother)	*First settlement in Canaan, c.* 1230	
1200		Ashur-nīrāri III (6) 1203–1198						*End of Khatti* *c.* 1200	*Judges* *c.* 1200–1020	1200
		Enlil-kudurri-uṣur (5) 1197–1193								
	Meli-Shikhu (15) 1188–1174	Ninurta-apil-Ekur (13) 1192–1180								
	Marduk-apla-iddina (13) 1173–1161	Ashur-dan I	Shutruk-Nahhunte (son)							
	Zababa-shuma-iddina (1) 1160									
	Enlil-nādin-akhi (3) 1159–1157	(46)	Kutir-Nahhunte							
1150	Marduk-kabit-ahhēshu (18) 1156–1139	Ninurta-tukulti-Ashur								1150
	Itti-Marduk-balāṭu (8) 1138–1131	Mutakkil-Nusku 1179–1134	Shilkhak-In-Shushinak (brother)							

Cambridge Histories Online © Cambridge University Press, 2008

DATE	BABYLONIA	ASSYRIA	ELAM	MITANNI	UGARIT	CARCHEMISH	AMURRU	KHATTI	ISRAEL	DATE
	Ninurta-nādin-shumi (6) 1130–1125	Ashur-rēsha-ishi I (18) 1133–1116								
1100	Nebuchadrezzar I (22) 1124–1103	Tiglath-pileser I (39) 1115–1077	Khutelutush-In-Shushinak							1100
	Enlil-nādin-apli (4) 1102–1099		Silkhina-khamru-Lakamar (brother)							
	Marduk-nādin-ahhē (18) 1098–1081									
	Marduk-shāpik-zēri (13) 1080–1068	Ashared-apil-Ekur (2) 1076–1075								
1050	Adad-apla-iddina (22) 1067–1046	Ashur-bēl-kala (18) 1074–1057								1050
		Erība-Adad II (2) 1056–1055								
		Shamshi-Adad IV (4) 1054–1051								
	Marduk-ahhē-erība (1) 1045	Ashurnaṣirpal I (19) 1050–1032								

	Marduk-zēr-[*x*] (12) 1044–1033									
	Nabu-shumu-libur (8) 1032–1025	Shalmaneser II (12) 1031–1020								
	Simbar-Shikhu (18) 1024–1007	Ashur-nīrāri IV (6) 1019–1014							Saul *c.* 1020–1000	
	Ea-mukīn-zēri (5 mos.) 1007	Ashur-rabi II (41) 1013–973								
	Kashshu-nādin-akhi (3) 1006–1004									
1000	E-ulmash-shākin- shumi (7) 1003–987								David *c.* 1000–960	1000
	Ninurta-kudurri-uṣur (3) 986–984									
	Shirikti-Shuqamuna (3 mos.) 984	Ashur-rēsha-ishi II (5) 972–968								
	Mar-bīti-apla-uṣur (6) 983–978	Tigleth-pileser II (33) 967–935							Solomon *c.* 960–930	